THE SCHOOL REVIEW
A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XVIII
NUMBER 4

APRIL, 1910

WHOLE
NUMBER 174

LATIN COMPOSITION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

I. AS THE COLLEGE CONCEIVES IT

WM. GARDNER HALE
The University of Chicago

Latin composition has the name of being a hard and disagreeable study. The second supposed quality follows from the first. It will be worth while to inquire how far the hardness is due to the aims which we set ourselves, and the methods which we use. A rough index of the former may be seen in college-entrance examinations in composition—which nearly every college prints, even if it admits almost wholly by certificate. An exact index of both the former and the latter is afforded by our composition manuals. I shall accordingly consider printed tests in the present paper, and books in another.

In making this examination, I proceed upon the conviction (generally held) that composition is capable of being a most effective instrument in the learning of a language; and I do not debate this point.

Its primary purpose is to enable the student to *read* Latin more easily. It is intended mainly to fix forms and constructions in his mind (words in lesser degree), so that, as he meets them in his Latin authors, he shall more easily and more surely recognize their force—that is, more easily and more surely apprehend the *meaning* of his author. This must always remain, for the schools, the leading purpose, and everything else should be made subservient to it. But it is also true, and important, that the writing of Latin, properly done, affords an excellent training

in clear thinking, and, in proportion to its advancement, will react favorably upon the student's power of effective and discriminating expression in his own language.

My own interest in the subject (together with my justification in writing the present paper) is due in part to my having taught it in regular Caesar classes in the University High School, in connection with teachers' training courses in the University of Chicago. My dissatisfaction with the material which I found available in this work led me to experiments of my own, and these led me to write a book, soon to be issued from the press. This last fact, I trust, does not disqualify me for expressing opinions. We have far too little debate in America between men who directly represent differing views. I, for one, should welcome criticism from those who are doing the same kind of work with myself, provided that it is specific, not vague. Europe is far in advance of us in this respect. In general, the reviewers sought by European journals are men who have themselves published in the respective fields.

As a member of the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin (the report was published in the February number of this journal), I prepared a paper before our meeting, embodying the results of a careful study of examination papers in composition, and offering recommendations looking toward reform. Such a study is valuable, in spite of the fact that most students are now admitted on certificate. For, first, the papers published by colleges admitting in this way represent what these institutions presumably ask of the schools which their inspectors visit and accredit, or do not accredit. And, second, but much more important, our composition books, with few exceptions, are made by teachers in schools which send a considerable proportion of their students to colleges admitting only upon examination; and it is inevitable that the authors should have these examinations in mind. There is positive proof that they do; the Dodge and Tuttle, Daniell and Brown, Allen and Phillips, and Bennett books, for example, give *specimens* of such papers, prepared by examiners in colleges from Maine to California. The books made under these influences are used throughout the

country. The question whether the examination papers set in composition by our colleges are wise and just is thus one which, directly or indirectly, concerns us all; and I start with this inquiry. I have the most recent papers of the better-known institutions at my hand. But, while they differ individually, they do not differ appreciably *as a class* from those which I used from the last edition of the Daniell-Brown book of 1905, in preparing my study for our commission; and I accordingly avail myself of the results then reached, reproducing a few of the papers, together with two more recent ones given by Harvard and the College Entrance Examination Board. Without actual specimens of papers, criticism would be useless.

It should be premised that the elementary composition paper of the colleges requiring examination, and of many which admit mainly by certificate, corresponds in theory to two years of work in composition, that is, in the average case, to the second and third years of the schools (the years, generally, of Caesar and Cicero reading); while the advanced paper corresponds in theory to the fourth year (the year, generally, of the Virgil reading). A complication, of course, takes place in cases where Virgil is read in the third year, and Cicero in the fourth.

ELEMENTARY EXAMINATIONS

BOWDOIN, JUNE, 1905

I alone, a general clad-in-the-toga, seem likely to (to be about to) quell this war. Under my administration (abl. abs.) not even wickedness will suffer punishment. But by manifest recklessness, by dangers threatening the fatherland, this leniency can be destroyed (*intereo*). But if this shall happen, no good (man) and few bad (men) will be put to death (*intereo*).

HARVARD, JUNE, 1905

You all see that the wickedness of my enemies has been stirred up by somebody. If they should repent of their fury, they would gain great glory. But these men are so base that I am prepared to threaten them with death.

DARTMOUTH, JUNE, 1905

In no other case since the founding of the city have all good men held one and the same opinion. Senators and knights are so agreed that they vie with each other in love of country. And if this harmony shall have been confirmed during my consulship, we may hope that it will be perpetual.

PRINCETON, JUNE, 1905

Translate into Latin section A and either B or C.

A. 1. If Caesar had not led his cavalry against the Gauls, he could not have conquered them.

2. When the Gauls saw that he would attack them, they retreated in another direction.

3. Cicero made a speech for the purpose of driving Catiline from Rome.

B. Caesar wished to cross the river in order to drive the enemy from their camp, which had been placed on the top of a hill. For he had been told that they had come out from their camp and were plundering the country, and that, although his light-armed troops had attacked them, they had not fled.

C. I will manage the matter in such a way, citizens, that the wicked shall suffer punishment for their crimes, and, trusting to the help of the gods, I promise you that if you punish these few men, the whole city will be safe.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JANUARY, 1905

Scipio heard that Hannibal was in Gaul and at once sent a few horsemen to learn what he was doing. Laelius, who was in command of these soldiers, left camp at the third hour. When he had marched four days, he came to a large river. Having crossed this by a bridge, he pitched camp. Laelius thought that his men could not be attacked by the enemy, because the camp was surrounded by such a wide river that the latter could not cross it.

HARVARD, JUNE, 1908

Larcius and Herminius, seeing Horatius stand alone, ran across the bridge to help him; and these three men fought so bravely that the enemy were afraid. "If the Etruscans cross the river," said Horatius, "our city will be captured."

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD, JUNE, 1909

The next day Sempronius, on learning that the enemy was approaching, sent Cassius with fifteen hundred soldiers to occupy a hill which was distant about two miles, for the purpose of resisting the enemy and delaying his march as long as possible. He himself remained where he was, to see whether the troops he has asked of the senate would come to his assistance; if they did not he had determined to defend his camp by every means for he hoped that the approach of winter would force his opponents to retire into winter quarters.

ADVANCED EXAMINATIONS

HARVARD, JUNE, 1905

Caesar, fearing that Dumnorix would stir up the Gauls, determined to take him into Britain. But Dumnorix said to the Gauls that Caesar would

kill all whom he took across the sea. Accordingly, while the Romans were so busy with the ships that no one noticed him, he left the camp, accompanied by horsemen. But Caesar sent other horsemen to bring him back, and said to them, "If he should not obey you, kill him." Dumnorix did resist and was killed, shouting that he was a free man in a free state.—Based on Caesar, *Gallic War*, v. 6, 7.

DARTMOUTH, JUNE, 1905

He even confesses that he is an enemy, and now that we have a wall between him and us, why should we fear either Catiline or those who do not hesitate to follow that worst of leaders into the most shameful of crimes? Much more to be dreaded now are those who still remain at Rome, since by concealing their hatred they may deceive you all, and yet we do not so much desire to punish them as to reform them, if it can be done.

PRINCETON, JUNE, 1905

Let us now determine what limits there are in friendship. I find that there are current three opinions, but I do not agree with any of them. In my opinion they are worthy of friendship, in whom there exists a reason why they should be loved. Yet most men pick their friends as they do cattle, those from whom they hope to receive the greatest advantage. Such men never find that most beautiful and natural friendship, which is desirable for itself alone, for a true friend is as it were a second self.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JUNE, 1905

Upon this point I will not say more at present. Last of all there was the fact that a seasonable return from this region rather than a longer advance was sought by our soldiers. Mithridates, on the other hand, had strengthened the army which had been collected from his own kingdom, and was aided by the forces of many kings and nations. Now we have observed that it is wont to happen that the misfortunes of kings easily win the aid of many, especially of those who either are kings or live in a kingdom, so that the royal name seems to be great and holy.

The first thing that must strike the reader is that the papers of the same grade are of very unequal length. The Harvard elementary paper, for example, is just half as long as the University of California paper. The Leland Stanford Jr. paper, which I have not printed, is twice as long as that of California, or four times as long as Harvard's.

The second striking fact is that the subjects of three of the elementary papers are taken from the *Cicero* cycle of ideas. This is because most of the colleges that set papers in examina-

tion set two only, not three. In order, then, to be sure that the student has had composition in his third year (which is ordinarily the year for reading Cicero), they feel that the paper must be of the Cicero kind. The natural temptation then is to make the advanced paper cover the omitted range of ideas, and so, inverting the natural order, to set one of the *Caesar* kind, as in the case of the Harvard paper. The difficulty, which would not exist if there were three papers, is inherent in the system. But the colleges are unwilling to increase the number of examinations, and there is therefore probably no direct remedy. The indirect remedy, so far as there can be one, would be to frame the English passages for translation in such a way as to demand, *in considerable variety,* those constructions which are most common in Caesar and Cicero taken together.

The Princeton elementary paper permits a choice in the second half, and thus provides for an examination mainly on the Caesar range of ideas, if the student prefers. The actual situation would have been better met if B had been omitted, so that the student would have been obliged to translate a passage of *each* kind.

The Princeton advanced paper deals with still another range of ideas, and is, in point of fact, founded on Cicero *De amicitia,* the first sentence being taken from xvi. 56, the second from xxi. 79, and so on. This lies outside of what most students read.

Let us now examine some of the papers in greater detail. The Bowdoin, Harvard, and Dartmouth elementary papers involve few constructions, and these do not include the ones that are most frequent either in Cicero or in Caesar. The Harvard paper, alone of the three, has any construction in indirect discourse, and the sole example is that of the infinitive of statement. The clause of result appears in the Harvard and Dartmouth papers, but not in the Bowdoin paper. There is no example of purpose in any of the papers, none of *cum, ubi, ut, postquam,* or *simul atque* in narration, none of the causal or adversative *cum*-clauses, none of subjunctive substantive clauses. Yet the clauses specified, together with clauses in indirect discourse (including indirect questions), are, with the clause of result, by far the

most common of all subjunctive constructions, alike in Caesar and in Cicero. If the student ought to learn to use them in his composition work, some of them, certainly, ought to be brought into the elementary paper.

So far, probably everybody would agree with me. But I should go farther.

For "threaten" in the Harvard elementary paper, the word wanted is *minor, minitor,* or *comminor,* and the construction is that of the dative and accusative. *Comminor* is late, and does not occur anywhere in Cicero or Caesar. *Minitor* does not occur in Caesar. It occurs four times in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.*:[1] once with accusative and no dative, *quam (mortem) illi fortasse minitantur* (*Cat.* iv. 10, 20), where *illi* is nominative plural; once with an ablative of "instrument" (*ferro flammaque*) and dative (*Cat.* ii. 1, 1) once with dative and an ablative of a different kind, *magnis copiis* (*Pomp.* xv. 45); and once with dative alone (*Pomp.* xx. 60). *Minor* does not occur in Caesar. It occurs in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.* but once (*Pomp.* xx. 58), and here with neither an accusative nor a dative. Thus the student who is passing the elementary examination, and has read both Caesar and Cicero, has seen the accusative with a verb "threaten" but once, and has never seen the combination of accusative and dative.

For "repent" in the Harvard elementary paper, *paenitet* is wanted. It occurs once in the *Gallic War,* and with a genitive (iv. 5), and once in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.,* with a genitive, of which there are two examples, connected by *atque* (*Cat.* iv. 10, 20), and once, without a genitive, in *Aen.* i–vi (i. 549). The construction is thus not only relatively difficult, but relatively *rare.*

It belongs, to be sure, to a much esteemed rule—the use of the genitive with the impersonal verb, *miseret, paenitet, piget, pudet,* and *taedet,* and the personal verbs, *misereor* and *miseresco;* and that is the reason for bringing it in. Let us see, then, how things stand with this construction in high-school Latin. *Paenitet* has been dealt with. The other words do not occur in the Caesar

[1] My statements are based on these six orations, because they are the ones most commonly read in the schools. They are the ones on which Lodge bases the Cicero part of his *Vocabulary,* to be mentioned below.

or Cicero. *Miseret* occurs with a genitive in *Aen.* v. 354, *misereor* in ii. 143, 144, iv. 318, 435, vi. 117 (two examples); *piget* in v. 678 (two), *pertaesum* in iv. 18 (two) and v. 714 (two). Taking the "rule" as a whole, then, we have one example in *B.G.* i–iv, two (together) in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.,* and thirteen in *Aen.* i–vi. Obviously, though the construction is still rare at the end of the third high-school year, it should be treated in that year, that is, in a composition book of the *Cicero* grade, for the sake of the Virgil reading which is to come; and it may fairly be asked for in an examination which covers Caesar and Cicero. The Harvard paper is therefore technically justified at this point; and we have incidentally reached a specimen of the more difficult questions which any careful maker of a composition book must face, and of the nature of the solution. But surely, in view of the rarity of this particular construction at this stage, it is not entitled to crowd out any of the common constructions. The total range of noun-constructions in the Harvard paper is small, and the rare ones with *paenitet* and *minitor* form too large a proportion of the whole. The maker of the paper has forced the student to stake too much upon a little.

The Princeton elementary paper, in A, sentence 1, "if Caesar had not led his cavalry against the Gauls, he could not have conquered them," calls for a knowledge of the special Roman idiom of the indicative in conclusions contrary to fact with verbs of obligation, ability, etc., and a discrimination in favor of it as against the subjunctive, or the opposite. The construction occurs but once in Caesar, and, even there, in the *indirect* form (*non fuisse difficile,* i. 14). It is one of the most puzzling constructions in Latin, and not suitable for an elementary paper.

I add brief illustrations from other elementary papers which there is not space to print in full.

The University of California paper of January, 1909, calls for the ablative with *opus est.* The construction occurs but once in the *Gallic War* (and that, too, in the *complex* form, *si quid opus facto esset,* i. 42), while it does not occur at all in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.*

The University of Chicago paper of 1905 (which is intended for students at the end of the second high-school year) calls for the conclusion contrary to fact in indirect discourse. This peculiarly difficult construction occurs only twice in Caesar, i–iv (i. 34 and i. 14), and the matter is further complicated by the fact that the second example (*non fuisse difficile,* mentioned above) represents a very un-English idiom. Thus the construction which the student is expected to write has been seen but once in his reading.

The Leland Stanford Jr. elementary paper reprinted by Daniell and Brown calls for the verb *interest,* "it is for the advantage of . . . . ," with the genitive of a noun, or the ablative feminine of the possessive pronoun (in this particular case, the latter). The student has seen the genitive in one place (*B.G.* ii. 5), with two examples, coupled by *-que,* and the ablative of the possessive adjective in one place (Cic. *Cat.* iv. 5, 9). This belongs, then, to the rarer constructions. But I should add that, with this exception, the Stanford paper is good, and that it is of sufficient length to reduce materially the risk which the candidate runs through the intrusion of the rare and difficult construction.

We turn to the advanced composition. The Harvard paper is excellent, but it is elementary in its vocabulary, its constructions, and its range of ideas—in other words, in every respect. A student reasonably trained in composition of the Caesar grade should have no trouble in passing the *advanced* paper; whereas we have seen that, in order to be able to pass well the *elementary* paper spoken of above, a student must have had composition of the Cicero grade, at least. Putting aside the matter of length *and vocabulary,* each of the Harvard papers would have been better suited to its purpose if the advanced one had been made the elementary, and the elementary the advanced.

To this general criticism let me add a somewhat careful test of the respective vocabularies called for. I have translated the two Harvard papers into simple Latin, giving every benefit of doubt. For the elementary paper under discussion, I used 29 words. Of these, 10 occur less than five times each in *B.G.* i–iv. For the advanced paper, I used 63 words. Of these, 7 occur less

than five times each in *B.G.* i–iv. Of the *advanced* vocabulary, then, only 11 per cent. appear less than five times in the reading of the *Caesar* year, while of the *elementary* vocabulary, 34 per cent. appear less than five times in that reading. That is to say, at the end of his second year in the high school a student would be better equipped, so far as vocabulary is concerned, to take the advanced paper than to take the elementary one. Further, of the 10 words in the elementary paper (on a Cicero subject) which appear less than five times in *B.G.* i–iv, 4 appear less than five times also in Cic. *Cat., Pomp., Arch.,* or, if one counts adjectives and related adverbs together (as *turpis* and *turpiter*), 3; and 2 of these appear less than five times in the ordinary Caesar and Cicero put together. This last number (2) is 7 per cent. of 29. So, then, at the end of two years in the high school a student would find but 11 per cent. of what may be called unfamiliar words, if he took the paper which belonged *a year ahead of him,* while at the end of three years he would still find 7 per cent. of unfamiliar words if he took the paper which belonged *one year behind him.*

With the dropping of the two rare constructions and the changing of the vocabulary, this Harvard elementary paper would be a very easy one. As it is, it is distinctly a hard one, as any teacher can learn by setting a fairly good third-year student at work upon it.

On the other hand, the Harvard elementary paper of June, 1908, is a very easy one, and, in my judgment, an insufficient test. The difference between this and the other paper is immense. I would suggest that the same young man be asked to write both. It has been done for me (by two high-school students), and the comparison is startling.

The University of California elementary paper is an admirable one in every way. The proper names are different from those which the student has had in his reading; but to this there can be no objection, since their inflection is simple. The vocabulary otherwise, and the constructions, and the range of ideas, are the same as in Caesar. The paper is also of suitable length.

The elementary paper of the College Entrance Board is a

little more difficult than the California paper, but it is perfectly reasonable. It calls for a considerable variety of constructions. But these are all common, like the words. A student risks far less upon chance in facing such a paper than in facing one that contains only a few constructions, but includes rare ones.

We return to the advanced papers. The Princeton paper reprinted in our collection, without calling for much knowledge of constructions, is distinctly difficult in vocabulary. Thus "are current" is hard to match (Cicero uses *ferri*). "In my opinion," *mea sententia,* seems easy to an instructor in Latin, but the student sees it only once (*Pomp.* xx. 58) in all his presumable high-school reading. "A second self" would be difficult for the candidate, though, to the older man, Cicero's *alter idem,* from *De amicitia* xxi. 80, is familiar.

I have not yet mentioned the most remarkable thing about the advanced papers. It is that, as a class, *they do not call for anything like so large a proportion of the rare and difficult constructions as the elementary papers do.* This appears to be true, not only in the papers which I have reprinted, but throughout the sets of selections given by the composition books mentioned, and throughout the additional papers which I have had at hand. As things have thus far been, the best advice to give to a teacher would be, "for an elementary examination, drill your students on the rare constructions; for an advanced examination, drill them on the common ones." I am confident, in view of the action of our commission, even if the present article should have no effect, that this state of things will be reformed.

An indirect result of the grouping of years in our composition papers should not be overlooked. The elementary examination, as has already been said, is taken after the student has read his Caesar and his Cicero. He must have had composition in both years in order reasonably to hope to pass it. If he has performed his work fairly well, he has nothing to do in order to pass the *advanced* composition a year later, except not to forget. To accomplish this end, a few desultory exercises are likely to be given. There is no inducement to the teacher to carry on systematic work. The case is, of course, still worse with

the schools which send most of their students into college by certificate. But, if the writing of Latin is a helpful training, it ought not to be dropped at the end of the third year. The only remedy is that the colleges requiring examinations should prepare advanced papers which, without being unreasonable, will be searching, and should *mark* them rigorously; and that colleges admitting on certificate should decline to accredit in Latin where composition is not made a regular part of the work of the fourth year.

A word is also needed with regard to the prevalent idea that so-called "simple" or "detached" sentences are easier than connected sentences. The exact opposite is true. Other things being equal, a sentence is *easier* to translate if it has context to resolve any question about the meaning. The mere fact of passing from one set of ideas to another increases the difficulty. Think how enormously harder the *Gallic War,* for example, would be, if no two successive sentences were consecutive!

The real difficulty in this matter, just as in the matter of rational and connected Latin and English for the first-year books, and of similar English in the composition books, lies, not with the student, but with the *author* of the particular examination paper or elementary book or composition book. It often costs great labor (less for the examination papers than for the books) to make, under the limitations of proper vocabulary, syntax, and cycle of ideas, a piece of English or Latin that shall say nothing foolish, and that shall knit together what it says. But it is worth while that the author should be put to this labor, since it is worth while for the student to get the idea that Latin was the language of a people that said sensible things, and said them consecutively. The material given in composition papers should consist of consecutive sentences, printed in one mass, or in paragraphs, according to the contents.

In what has thus far been said, I have assumed as obvious that the words, constructions, and range of ideas in examination papers in composition should be such as are common in the reading to which they correspond. Now, it has appeared, in our examination of actual papers, that, in justice to students, the

makers of the papers *must not trust their feelings* as to what is common, in words or constructions. Fortunately, there are now helps by which they may test their impressions.

Browne's *Latin Word-List* (Ginn and Co.), a little vest-pocket book of about 2½ by 5¼ inches, presents the vocabulary of Caesar's *Gallic War* and *Civil War* and of Cicero's *Orations* (entire) arranged in the order of frequency, and by the parts of speech, with an extremely ingenious but simple device by which one may have the translations either covered, or open and directly beside the respective words, and may start from either the Latin or the English side. The book would be a very valuable help in preparation for Latin reading in general, and every college student, and nearly every teacher, in school or college, might profit by it. In basing his work on so large a range of reading, the author had translation at sight in mind. But it seems to me that the resulting number of words is too large.[2] To take extreme illustrations, *vadimonium,* "bail," appears among the nouns occurring from twenty-five to fifty times. But the word does not occur anywhere in the *Gallic War,* and occurs only twice in any of the orations read in the schools. Moreover out of the actual 40 occurrences, which seem a goodly number, 29 are in the single oration *Pro Quinctio.* Again, *medimnum,* "bushel," is given in the same list. It does, to be sure, occur 43 times; but 42 of these occurrences are in a single one of the Verrine orations, and the remaining one in another Verrine. High-school students would not be repaid for time spent in memorizing these words. It is greatly to be wished that Mr. Browne would make another book on the same convenient plan, but confining the vocabulary to the most commonly read high-school Latin.

The other book is Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin* (published by The Teachers College, Columbia University). The

[2] I regret this the more, because I was glad to see, in two brief pages at the end of the book, a mood treatment which I cannot but admire, since it is based largely upon my own, having, for example, the volitive subjunctive, the anticipatory subjunctive, and concession for the sake of argument, which probably came to the author indirectly, through Bennett's grammar, and the subjunctive of obligation or propriety (as the explanation of the subjunctive with *dignus qui*), which must have come directly from the Hale-Buck grammar.

plan is to give the entire vocabulary of Caesar, *B.G.*, i–v, Cic., *Cat., Pomp., Arch.*, and Virgil, *Aen.* i–vi, and to select, for memorizing, 2,000 words that appear five times or more. I quote from the Preface:

> The 1,000 words printed in bold-faced type contain the words of most frequent occurrence in Caesar. They should be learned by the end of the Caesar year, 500 having probably been learned during the first year. The 500 words printed in large Roman type are found most often or first in Cicero and should be learned by the end of the third year. The remaining 500 words, printed in small capitals, should be learned by the end of the Virgil year.

And again:

> I have added, in order to make up 2,000 in round numbers, a certain number of words that occur less often than five times, and eight words that are not found at all. These are *gracilis* and seven numerals, that were necessary for brief but systematic treatment of the numerals. Of the remainder, some have been added for grammatical reasons, bcause it is simpler to learn a complete list than to omit one or two; some because study of other authors shows them to be important; a few because they are identical in form with words included and consequently are best learned together with their homonyms.

The words added to make the 2,000 are not distinguished to the eye, as they might easily have been—for example by an asterisk or a dagger. Moreover, I suspect that Lodge has been too desirous of dividing up his round 2,000 words exactly by multiples of 500, and has thus put into bold-faced type words which are *not* "of most frequent occurrence" in Caesar (i–v) and, sometimes, words which are not common in Caesar (i–v) and Cicero (*Cat., Pomp., Arch.*) taken together, or even in these and Virgil (*Aen.* i–vi) taken together. Thus *paenitet,* which occurs but once in the *Gallic War,* and but three times (in two passages) in all the vocabulary of high-school Latin put together, is put in bold-faced type; and so are *miseret* and *misereor,* which do not occur *at all* in either the Caesar or the Cicero. This would seem to have been done for the sake of the "complete list" of the rule. But the same reasoning would demand that *piget, pudet,* and *taedet* should be in the same type; and they are not, though *pudet* appears three times in Cicero. *Decipio* is in bold-faced

type, though it occurs only once in the Caesar reading, and not at all in the Cicero. Adverbs, too, are not treated separately from nouns and adjectives, with figures of their own (thus *partim, modo, turpiter*). It is of course also inevitable that other workers should differ from the author about the words *important* to memorize in the Caesar year, and therefore to be put into bold-faced type. I should not so class *gravo,* which appears but once in the Caesar reading (here *gravor*), and once in the Cicero, while omitting *afficio,* which Lodge says occurs 5 times in Caesar. *Arbitror,* which occurs 29 times in Caesar, and *despero,* which occurs 11 times, I should most unhesitatingly put in bold-faced type, as Lodge does not. The book must therefore be used with discrimination by anyone who wishes to see whether he is asking, in an examination paper, for those words only that are fairly common in the authors of the corresponding reading. Merely to look at the type will not be sufficient. It is to be hoped that changes in the direction of an easier grasp of the facts will be made in a future edition. But at any rate the book, which must have cost heavy labor, does give the facts, and should be employed by everyone who makes an examination paper in composition or in translation at sight, unless he goes directly to his indices of authors.

So much for the keeping of comparatively infrequent words out of examination papers. The other point made above, the keeping out of constructions comparatively rare at the stage reached (together with the getting in of common constructions), is not less important. For help in this, examiners have a recent book, Lee Byrne's *The Syntax of High School Latin* (The University of Chicago Press, 1909).[3] In this, Byrne, with the help of a large number of collaborators, has endeavored to count, and give the book or oration of, every construction occurring in high-school Latin, covering the same field as Lodge, except that (wisely, in my opinion), he includes only four books of Caesar, not five. I do not regard the work as final, but its general plan is excellent, and its aim sound. It ought to be employed by every college examiner, to the end that rare construc-

[3] I have reviewed it on pp. 284–86 of the present issue of this journal.

tions may not be demanded. It is the *common* constructions that should be asked for, not the opposite. If our students, as a rule, could write ordinary Latin well, it would be quite right, and even desirable, to try them upon the rare constructions. As it is, it is neither.

So much for the examination papers. We have found them to be, as a whole, not very carefully planned. In various instances they pass outside the range of ideas of the authors read, they call for words that are not common, and constructions that are not common, and they leave many common constructions uncalled for. Greater pains on the part of those who make them would give greater definiteness to the work of the schools that prepare for them, diminish the danger of unfairness to the candidates, and set a more reasonable ideal before the writers of textbooks in the subject. It is much to be hoped that such pains will be taken, and that the recommendation adopted by the Commission on College-Entrance Requirements in Latin and published in the report will come true, namely: "The words, constructions, and range of ideas called for in the examinations in composition will be such as are common in the reading of the year, or years, covered by the particular examination."

The concluding paper will deal with the present ideals and plans of the books by means of which Latin composition is taught.

FOUR INSTRUMENTS OF CONFUSION IN TEACHING PHYSICS

H. L. TERRY
State Department of Education, Madison, Wisconsin

The texts in physics in common use both in the East and in the West have been written to meet the eastern requirements; consequently, while many of the western colleges allow a satisfactory amount of freedom, the result, through the use of these texts, has practically been that the eastern requirements have directed the work.

These requirements have been such, at least up to the time of the recent modifications, that it has been practically impossible to meet them in any satisfactory manner in schools in which, as is the case for instance in the free high schools of Wisconsin, the subject is almost universally a required one. Even the new requirements are still so largely quantitative in their spirit that there is great room for doubt as to the advisability of attempting to prepare for college unless the doubtful practice, so commonly being adopted, of making the college preparatory an elective course is to prevail. This would mean that if pupils are to be given to any adequate extent the wider view of life and its relations, with a permanent interest in the natural phenomena about them, separate classes must be formed whose work will not count as a preparation for study in a higher school.

The results up to this time of the attempts to give to all students a general course which would meet the two purposes have been far from satisfactory from the standpoint of either life or the college. Neither interest nor ability has as a rule been developed. Even in schools having special preparatory classes the subject is elected by comparatively few, and those taking it because they really like it are much fewer still. On the other hand, the attempt to make the general class meet the requirements has resulted in very imperfect ideas coupled too often with

an actual dislike of anything related to the distorted meaning attached to the word physics.

I will illustrate by describing a typical case: A young lady with whom I am well acquainted was studying physics, not in the backwoods, but in a large school, in the shadow of what is by common consent considered a great university. The class was in charge of a well-educated young man who has since been promoted to a still better position. In conversation with the young lady I asked her to tell me in plain English the meaning of specific gravity. To make the question more concrete I used a piece of wood as an illustration, and asked what is meant when we say its specific gravity is .6. She began by giving me correctly the formal definition: "Specific gravity is the ratio, etc., etc." This was not plain, everyday, common English. Then she told me how to find specific gravity. This would have no meaning to a person who had never studied physics. She finally gave up in despair, and I suggested that the expression meant simply, in the case under consideration, that the piece of wood weighed .6 as much as the same bulk of water. Almost in astonishment she declared that she had never thought of it in that way before.

Judging from the answers to this and many similar questions received from hundreds of pupils I feel that I am safe in saying that this was a case typical of the large majority. The student was, I think, certainly up to the average in ability to comprehend physics, and she had a natural liking for the subject. At any rate she can now talk intelligently of the carburetor, throttle and needle valves, the flywheel, and the mixture of air and gas in the motor in her launch, and moreover the little engine responds more readily to her touch than it does to that of others who might be supposed to be better qualified than she in physics. She even fully appreciates the advantage of the system of pulleys used to lift the door of the boathouse. She is now a Senior in the university, but her dislike for the study is such that she has refused to elect it in her course even though she might have taken it under one of the most skilful and interesting professors in the

whole country. I do not mean to imply that the work is all poor, but the results as a whole are not what they should be.

Now in studying the general situation and especially in analyzing the means used in teaching, aside from the influence of the personality of the teacher, I cannot help concluding that the great defect lies in the misuse of four great tools of instruction, fine tools in their proper place and used at the proper time, but as used in our high schools under the conditions existing in Wisconsin, at least, turned to what may fitly be called instruments of confusion. These instruments are:

1. *Measurement.*—Undue emphasis is placed upon accurate measurement, especially with delicate and complicated apparatus. I suppose that in the case described above the pupil had been put through the usual course. There was first some brief introductory work, mainly by the teacher, with little attempt to make use of what the student already knew of the subject. Instead of some roughly approximate measurement using a familiar spring balance, a large block of some substance, and a tank of water, she was probably given a carefully adjusted balance and a small bit of some material, and required to make from ten to twenty weighings, to average the results, and to write the whole according to a prescribed form in a notebook. She was fortunate if the time of the instruction and the time of the laboratory work were not some days or even weeks apart. By the time all this was done the poor little bit of physics involved was pretty effectually lost in the maze of manipulations and averages. It may have been excellent manual-training work, but it should have been done in that department.

Laboratory work is necessary, more necessary in these days of specialization than ever before, not as a specialist's instrument in the high school, but as a means of giving clearer conceptions of the topics studied, including the supplying of information which in earlier days would have come to the pupil as a part of his own experience. Much of physics which a generation or two ago was within the observation of the pupil in its entirety is now largely obscured. For instance, in the case of the water supply. In those days the boy saw the well dug, the pump and

piping installed, and the water obtained by the application of force; now he sees only the faucet. Then, the periodical candle-making from tallow produced on the farm was a somewhat exciting event, upon the success or failure of which meant a good or poor supply of light for the winter evenings; now a button is pushed, and the light comes without further question. The chain back to the source must be supplied by the laboratory work, a large part of which still should be outside of school.

2. *The mathematical work.*—The average exercise in the texts most in use when analyzed reveals a very small amount of physics in proportion to the mathematics involved. It would make excellent material for a parallel advanced class in mathematics—either algebra or geometry, or a combination of the two. I am hoping to see the experiment tried of having such classes, conducted if possible by the teachers of physics, but such work should not take the time of or be called physics.

Physics is a quantitative study and we must use some mathematics; but in my experience both as a teacher and as an inspector I have found that the mathematics must be very simple and that round numbers or very simple fractions must generally be used if the pupil's mind is to be kept clear for the physical principle. In testing Boyle's law, for illustration, the principle will be much clearer if the confined gas be reduced to approximately a half, a third, or a quarter, than if a smaller and more closely accurate measurement be attempted.

3. *The formula.*—Over and over I find pupils using formulas and securing correct answers to problems without any definite comprehension of the meaning of the formulas, the principles and phenomena involved, or of the answer obtained. I might give many illustrations drawn from experience, but he is a fortunate and an excellent teacher who cannot secure illustrations by asking his own pupils for explanations in clear, understandable, everyday English. Teachers do not appear to realize that a formula is an instrument to save thinking and that its use very soon becomes purely mechanical, as in the case of any rule-of-thumb process. In the hands of a beginner it is a dangerous

tool if he is expected to become an intelligent, independent man rather than a mere workman.

4. *Technical terms.*—These employed to the usual extent are the most dangerous of all instruments in their possible effects. More time is wasted in science classes in mere dictionary work than one can realize unless he has had opportunity for extended observation. Instead of starting with the phenomena, the thing itself, and gradually reaching a point of understanding such that a single word may be used instead of a group to express a thought and still keep the thought in mind, the teacher is all too likely to begin with the technical word and attempt to work backward in getting at the idea. Here again is the failure to understand that the symbol is a time-saving device and that it is utterly useless without the clear idea always back of it. The accumulation of the mass of technical terms in most of our secondary science teaching is almost appalling, and it is no wonder that so many pupils emerge at the end of the study in the bewildering condition indicated by the examination tests.

Physics is a study most wonderful in its possibilities, and I sincerely hope that in the near future the work may be so modified that its usefulness will appeal to our students so strongly that we may be able to resist the demand that it be made an optional study.

PROFESSOR MÜNSTERBERG'S CONCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM AND CONTENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY[1]

IRVING KING
The University of Iowa

Books purporting to deal with psychology in its relation to teaching do more and more abound. That the science of mental facts should have some bearing on the methods of mental training and instruction many of us have felt more or less dimly, but the books which have presumed to tell what that bearing is have one by one been sadly laid aside with the feeling that they have failed.

The reasons for this failure are largely due to an inadequate comprehension of the real problems involved. On the one hand, eminent psychologists have written treatises for the teacher on the apparent assumption that *any* correct description of mental facts and mental processes would, perforce, be of interest and value to the teacher because he is primarily concerned with the training of minds. This type of psychology was usually of a very general character, revealing no attempt at adaptation to the teacher's problems. It was often reputable psychology, but the teacher usually felt that it had no more to do with his work than it did with that of any other profession. In its next stage of development, educational psychology consisted largely of excerpts from the general science which were supposed to have some actual bearing upon teaching. The facts thus presented were nearly always superficial and inadequate because they were too often selected and applied by persons with little or no training in psychology. At best, such works were scrappy, devoid of definite organization, and lacking in scientific point of view. Educational psychology so conceived was a sort of bastard child

[1] *Psychology and the Teacher.* By HUGO MÜNSTERBERG. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1909. Pp. xii+330. $1.50 net.

of the real science of psychology, abhorred alike by the scientist, and by the serious teacher: by the former because it represented a shameless abuse of a reputable body of facts, and by the latter because it pretended to give bread and really offered only a stone.

In the last few years it has become increasingly manifest that psychology for the teacher, aside from the actual experimental investigation of school problems, must be written from some definite educational point of view furnishing the criterion for the selection and organization of whatever facts properly belong to this science. Such a work cannot be written by the teacher who is only an amateur in psychology. Neither can it be the work of the psychologist unacquainted with the needs and problems of the teacher. It should not be a piecemeal presentation of certain psychological superfluities but a serious scientific examination of the educational process with special reference to the psychological factors involved in it. The problem should be educational, and the organizing interests should be educational, but the facts chiefly considered should be psychological. It will be the point of view and the interest that lie back of the facts that will render the treatment something more than a rehash of general psychology.

In view of these things, we turn with interest to the recent book by Professor Münsterberg, *Psychology and the Teacher*. Certainly, as far as psychological facts are concerned, we may presume that the material presented is authoritative. We cannot help wondering, however, whether the philosopher and psychologist with his highly specialized interests can have had a sufficiently close acquaintance with the problems of elementary- and high-school teachers to be able to offer such teachers the definite help they need. To judge from the plan of the work, it seems that our author recognizes the necessity of a general organizing point of view that the subject-matter may have unity and definiteness. This point of view, he frankly holds, is an ethical one. We must, he says, first of all have an adequate conception of the educational ideal as well as of the ideal of life in general before we can arrive at any conclusions regarding what psychological facts are of importance for the art of teaching.

The book consists of three main parts. The ethical aspects of education are first discussed as a basis for the selection of the strictly psychological material which forms the next division of the book, and last of all there is a section of ninety-three pages devoted to the practical problems of curriculum and school administration. This plan offers practical possibilities, but in the realization of them even the sympathetic critic might feel that Professor Münsterberg is disappointing. For instance, the psychological facts bear no clear evidence of having been selected in accordance with the ethical principles laid down in the beginning, nor do the applications in the third part seem to be related to any extent to the psychological section. Here and there in the presentation of the psychological material itself there are brief statements of application.

It is not, however, the psychological material that concerns us here so much as the general presuppositions of the work. With the author's introductory statements of the nature and scope of educational psychology we find ourselves in hearty accord. It is, he tells us, one of the branches of applied psychology, bearing the same relation to the pure science that engineering does to physics. Of these various branches of applied psychology one relates to law and another to medicine. Of a truth, as he says, these applications are more than "a mere heaping of such bits of theoretical psychology as could possibly be utilized for practical purposes." They consist rather in a "systematic studying and experimenting with mental facts from the point of view and in the interest of practical needs." They "deal exclusively with the question: How can psychology help us reach certain ends?" (p. 95). Educational psychology must not be a "cheap compromise." "It surely would not do to recommend the cramming of some psychological laws and then simply add an appendix of moral appeals, nor would it be better to warm over the old traditional phrases of educational ideals and stuff them with fragments of sociology and child-study. What is really needed is a really organic union of the aims and of means, a true synthesis." The present writer believes in the soundness of this contention. Psychology as applied to educa-

tion has too long been a mere appendage to the theoretical science with no very definite status of its own. Most teachers will agree with Professor Münsterberg that a great deal of the psychology that they have been called upon to study has contributed very little to their pedagogical efficiency. As he says,

> The pile of interesting facts which the sciences heap up for the teacher's use grows larger and larger, but the teacher seems to stare at it with growing hopelessness. He blames himself and ever makes new efforts to master the facts, yet he cannot help feeling that they do not tell him what he ought to do. Perhaps he feels more erudite, but he does not feel wiser. . . . . The mere study of the child's nature and of the pupil's biology has too often been followed by sad disappointment.

Again, educational psychology is not theoretical psychology nor is it something tacked on to psychology with no valid ground of its own. It is rather an independent discipline with its own problems and its own methods of procedure.

In view of this clear appreciation of the problems of educational psychology it is with special interest that we turn to the proffered solution. The root of the present difficulty is, according to Professor Münsterberg, a failure to distinguish between facts and values, a point which he discusses at considerable length and to which he repeatedly recurs in different parts of the book. As he evidently regards this distinction as fundamental to his conception of educational psychology, we need to pause a moment to examine it. Facts as such, he contends, do not have the attribute of value. Science, therefore, as a study of facts in their causal relation, cannot be directly useful to the teacher. What the teacher needs, first of all, is to have a clearly recognized goal, having which he may hope to utilize his knowledge of facts for its realization. The great difficulty with the present-day attitude is that the aim of education has been too largely sought in the statements of science regarding the facts of the world. This fundamental mistake, the author says, has led to much hasty and ill-advised action supposedly based upon science when science is really absolutely neutral. Psychology, for instance, may state the conditions of imitation, but ethics alone can tell *what* it is desirable to imitate. "About a scien-

tific fact we can only say that it exists." Nothing is good or bad for science.

And yet the teacher must have an aim. Where can he get it? Professor Münsterberg's answer is that he must look to ethics. The world of values is a creation of the will, and to that world belong our purposes and our ideals; it is a realm with which science has nothing to do. In fact the universe of human desire and purpose must be rigidly set over against the brute fact. Having made such a sharp separation between fact and value—a distinction which no one would be disposed to deny, although one might wonder if it does not have an exaggerated importance attributed to it—it is interesting to follow up the author to see just how he is going to get hold of his values. Fact seems to be given ready-made. But what of value? Where does that come from? It is not something such as pleasure, which may be immediately perceived. In fact, a tendency of many persons to state the ideal in terms of pleasure illustrates, according to the author, the frequency of this methodological fallacy of seeking goals in mere facts. Pleasure, for instance, is a fact of experience, but one is not warranted on that account in setting it up as the object and end of all endeavor.

We have no disposition here to question the assertion that there is a distinction between fact and value. It is important of course that with an unclouded mind we should see what *is*. Mere facts do not in themselves tell us what we should do with them. And even though these mere facts are fictions of science and imagination, it is quite conceivable that there may be many crises in the practical affairs of life when it will be advantageous for getting on with our particular task to assume this abstract and really artificial attitude toward the content of experience and, without any bias, ask the question, *What is it that is actually given?* whatever it may be that we *wish* it were in view of our present purposes. But even though it should be necessary to assume such an attitude, it should never blind us to the fact that facts are always intimately associated in their origin and in their continuance in attention with human desires and purposes. They were not given ready-made but were in every case built up in

the course of following out some active purpose or other. Fact and purpose are normally fused in experience, and it is only when we fail to obtain our purposes that we set up either one of them in its artificial abstraction. We are not contending that there is no distinction between fact and purpose, but rather that though they may be separated for methodological purposes they actually exist side by side in the most intimate functional relations, that facts do determine purposes, and that an inadequate view of the facts often results in one-sided ideas and even in the complete miscarrying of our purposes. Hence we raise the question as to whether the grave errors to which our author calls attention as the outcome of the failure to distinguish fact from value are not rather the result of an inadequate acquaintance with the facts themselves. At any rate facts are so intimately associated in their origin and development with purposes and values that any conspicuous defect in a person's ideals may fairly be explained on the ground that he has not taken a sufficiently broad or intensive view of the facts involved.

Take as an instance of the above point the author's illustration of the abuse that has crept into education under cover of the doctrine of interest. He asserts that the teacher has, upon the admitted psychological fact of interest, based the unwarranted judgment that *all* work must be *made* interesting to the pupil. While it is a recognized psychological fact that some things arouse the immediate interest of the child, this scientific fact is entirely neutral as to whether the interest is actually desirable or undesirable. When, therefore, the teacher says that interest is itself good and that all things should be made interesting he may imagine that he is still talking about scientific fact when in reality he has passed into the sphere of judgment. That interest should be the goal is not the scientific fact that he supposes, but a judgment the validity of which depends upon other considerations than science. As a general proposition all this is true enough, but we should contend that there is another real and perhaps more serious difficulty than this methodological one. It is this: the teacher has neglected not so much to note that the scientific fact of spontaneous interest is neutral as to exercise

due precaution in the formation of the judgment itself. This mistake would be possible for anyone who knew that fact and value are different, not merely for the one who imagined that facts pointed definitely to certain values. We will admit that there is something wrong with the judgment that every school task must make an immediate appeal to the pupil's interest; but what is the source of the error? The present writer maintains that it is due to an inadequate acquaintance with the neutral facts themselves. The mistaken judgment regarding interest is a conclusion, an induction, but a hasty one, and based upon an insufficient acquaintance with the facts. The teacher who says that all school work must be made interesting needs to know more about the facts of interest and their relation to mental processes generally. Partly upon the basis of this larger knowledge of the particular nature of interest and partly on the basis of his broader knowledge of life he will form a valid judgment of the place of interest in education.

This better acquaintance with the facts would include some such data as these: First, the fact that interest is not *mere* feeling, but feeling in connection with some sort of self-expressive activity; then the further scientific fact that that which arouses spontaneous interest involves an instinctive and relatively primitive organization of the self; the scientific facts also, that more and more complicated attitudes may be constructed in the process of experience and that the activity through which any one of those attitudes functions is accompanied by the mental condition of interest. There would be other facts to take account of, such as the exact interrelations of interest and effort. This is not equivalent to saying that the more complicated attitudes are any better than the simpler ones nor that the interest associated with them is any more desirable to cultivate. The judgment that the teacher makes on this point will depend upon his general philosophy of life. This, however, is our point: the general philosophy of life will be more apt to make an intelligent judgment upon the problem of interest in education if it is in possession of this broader view of the facts than if it takes the narrow view suggested in Professor Münsterberg's treatment. And

mark you, this better judgment will come, not because the judger realizes and sharply distinguishes between fact and value, but because he has more facts upon which to base his judgment. It will be a good thing for him to recognize the difference between fact and value, but a recognition of that difference may be accompanied by a very erroneous act of judgment. Certainly as far as this illustration is concerned the prime difficulty is scarcely where our author supposes that it is. At any rate it is hard to see that the confusion of fact and value is a "peril to the intellectual life of the time." Is not a common willingness to rest satisfied with something less than a full view of the whole system of facts in all their subtle interrelations an even graver peril to our intellectual life?

We should take similar exception to the author's other illustrations, as for example, the misuse of the Darwinian theory of natural selection of the fittest. That some such principle seems to prevail in the brute world has been taken by some to mean that it should also prevail in human society, and that it should be the standard according to which social activity should shape itself. This crude application of the Darwinian hypothesis, however, has been due not to a confusion of fact and value but to a defective induction, a hasty conclusion from a superficial examination of biological and social facts that the law, which seems to hold so completely in the sphere of biology, also holds in the sphere of society. The primary difficulty is that the *facts are not clearly known.* Social conditions are more complex than was realized at first and, consequently, it is more difficult to ascertain the exact nature of the facts. When they are better understood the evaluating consciousness can avoid the errors of judgment which it might otherwise make.

Our point, as over against the author, is not that value is contained in scientific fact but that the determination of value, the setting-up of ideals, is a process which cannot be absolutely divorced from experience of fact, that, while fact is *fact* and not *value,* in the *development* of value fact serves an important function. The same criticism is to be passed on Professor Münsterberg's contention that many one-sided reform movements are due

to picking out a few facts regarding a certain tendency and jumping to the conclusion that these facts require further movement in that direction. We may remark that this transcending of the present fact, this statement that it tends one way or another, is a legitimate phase of scientific investigation. But the scientist must be careful not to infer future changes upon the basis of a too hasty examination of the given data. We should say that the main difficulty with the one-sided reformer is that he does not know his facts well enough.

There is another serious difficulty which most of us continually meet with. It is that which grows out of our not knowing how to connect psychological fact with our needs and purposes. We feel sure that even our author would admit that such a connection must finally be made, even though he has in the beginning insisted that there is a great gulf between the two. Is it as important for educational psychology to emphasize this methodological distinction, as it is to help the teacher to put together that which he had thus far largely failed to connect or which he has possibly wrongly connected?

Up to this point we have confined our attention to Professor Münsterberg's contention that facts and values are different. With this general proposition few would be inclined to disagree, although many would feel that an undue importance has been assigned to the difference as far as educational psychology is concerned. However that may be, there is still the further problem as to the origin of these values. Facts our author seems to regard as more or less objective, as given ready-made. But whence are values? True, the teacher must have ideals; but where is he to get them? It does not help very much to think of them as the product of free acts of will. Truth, beauty, and goodness are the ideals of life, and they should therefore be the ideals of all true educational effort. These concepts of value are, we are told, constructions of the will upon the brute realities of science, but in no sense deduced from them. This is true enough, but how have we come to make these constructions? Our author surely does not mean to say that we have an innate sense of any of them. They are free acts of will, he holds, and

yet in some way the will gets a cue as to what they are as it observes the chaos of the physical world and the equally chaotic world of human striving. That is, in the midst of the endless flux and change of phenomena certain uniformities are to be noted.

We come to this conclusion with somewhat of a shock after having been reminded so many times of the ultimate difference between fact and value. How can that which is mere fact give even a cue to the determination of value? Is not uniformity *just uniformity?* And how can it ever generate the idea that it is valuable and that it should therefore be striven for? This objection is entirely aside from another and more specific one that might be raised: whether the appreciation of beauty, for instance, depends ultimately upon the intellectual recognition of unity in the midst of diversity. And a similar question may be raised regarding the recognition of the good. These points are merely suggested as problems that Professor Münsterberg's philosophy must face in any thorough examination. Let us rather at this juncture note his own description of the origin of value and of these values in particular.

> How [he inquires] has this *worthless* [italics ours] chaos of haphazard experiences become the material of our complete satisfaction? Have all these values nothing in common? [We thought it was facts, not values, we were examining.] If we compare their structure can we find any one feature which characterizes all of them? Indeed such a feature is always present. . . . . In every one of these cases we have grasped some bit of experience, have held it, have maintained it, and have found it the same in a new experience. Yes, we may make the sweeping statement: all of these values have in common the one factor that a certain element of experience asserts itself. It is maintained in the changing chaos. It did not come up to disappear, but it could be found again in a new state.

All of the connections of scientists, of historians, of mathematicians, or logicians "are only different ways of expressing just that sameness which we claimed for all valuable experiences" (p. 56). It is this recognition of identity in the midst of diversity that gives us our first conceptions of truth, beauty, and goodness.

In fine, we should say that the upshot of the whole argu-

ment is trite and disappointing. We had expected to gain new insight into real problems, and we are rewarded by a purely formal, contentless statement to which each one would agree until the question of applying it appears, and then we recognize that we are no better off than before.

In two conspicuous ways, then, Professor Münsterberg's treatment of the ethical aspect of education is defective. In the first place, it insists upon the proposition that facts do not yie'd values, and then attempts to find value in a certain aspect of this very chaos of natural facts. And, by the way, we wonder whether it is so very necessary after all for educational psychology to concern itself with the philosophical problem of the origin of the ideal. It is far more important to find a good working conception of *what* ideals must be *real* ideals and how they can be brought into vital and dynamic contact with the concrete problems of teaching. In the second place, this theory is defective in that it offers a purely formal, contentless conception of the ideal; and this defect is to the writer's mind, far more serious than the first.

The psychological portion of the book has brief chapters upon the following subjects: "The Objections to Educational Psychology," "The Application of Psychology," "Mind and Brain," "The Biological Aspect," "Apperception," "Memory," "Association," "Attention," "Imitation and Suggestion," "Will and Habit," "Feeling," "Individual Differences." The mode of treating these subjects is closely allied to the special type of educational psychology referred to in the beginning of this article. That is to say, it is little more than the collection of excerpts from general psychology, apparently selected in part because they are suitable for having pedagogical application attached to them. But this is true only of a part of the material. For instance it would be hard to tell what particular significance the metaphysical theory of psychophysical parallelism has for the art of teaching; and many other illustrations might be given to the same effect. True, it may be well for the person who makes some pretense to culture to know about this theory; but that is altogether another matter and lies outside the province of edu-

cational psychology. On the whole one feels that this section is a rather uninspiring rehash of theoretical psychology, with the points selected according to no well-defined principle. One suspects, however, that the selection is based upon what Professor Münsterberg regards as those elementary facts of psychology with which the teacher just as a well-informed person should be acquainted. In so far as this idea controls the choice of material the work can hardly claim to be in any specific way an educational psychology. It is rather a piecemeal treatise on metaphysics and psychology for the general reader. In other words, notwithstanding the general interest of the work it bears no clear evidence of insight on the author's part into the real problem of psychology for the teacher.

It would be perhaps ungracious, in view of the statements of the preface, to refer to an apparent change in the author's point of view indicated by such a book as this. The suggestion is repeatedly offered that the psychological facts that have bearing upon teaching have largely appeared in the last decade under the stimulus of the author's suggestion, some ten years ago, that at that time psychology had as yet little or nothing to offer to the teacher. It is safe to say that the only positive teaching of those "much discussed essays" was that psychology does not and cannot affect the practical art of teaching. Certainly few persons got the idea from them that there is great need for the development of psychology along the line of educational problems. It is also safe to say that the remarkable development of the experimental study of educational problems in the last few years owes nothing to Professor Münsterberg unless it is the stimulus of contrary suggestion. At any rate there is little significant material presented in this book that can claim to be the distinctive fruitage of the last decade.

Into the last, the educational section, we do not have space to enter at this time. As we have before stated, it has no marked organic connection with the rest of the work. The suggestions are necessarily quite general, and though often interesting are more often commonplace. The last chapter on "The Teacher" is, however, a happy exception, and is well worth reading.

THE EXCHANGE OF ASSISTANT TEACHERS BETWEEN FRANCE AND GERMANY

OSKAR THIERGEN
Dresden

The meetings of German philologists which take place every two years in one of the great towns of the empire have for several years discussed the important question of the best preparation of the modern-language teachers for their professions. It is a matter of fact that up to a very recent date the universities offered no opportunity of learning everyday language, either French or English. The preparation of the future teacher for his office was entirely scientific. He was thoroughly acquainted with Anglo-Saxon grammar, he knew every line of *Beowulf,* and Piers Ploughman was a well-known person to him. But he was thrown into a state of dreadful perplexity if you asked him in modern English for anything concerning everyday life, and an English bill-of-fare was a riddle to him, which he could not read even if he was in danger of dying from starvation. A kind of change came into this state of things when "lectors"—i. e., native professors of France and England—were used at universities to instruct the student in modern French and English. But these two lessons a week were wholly inadequate for what is required to express one's thoughts idiomatically. So new means had to be found to make the students improve in modern French and English.

It was seven years ago that at the meeting of philologists at Breslau I proposed an exchange of assistant teachers between Germany, France, England, and America as a new and powerful means of enabling the future teacher to learn foreign languages. I referred to the new aims which the reform method of teaching had put up, and contended that it was next to impossible for a person who was not master of the foreign language to attain these aims. A stay in the foreign country was absolutely indispensable. But it was not the stay alone. I have seen persons return from France and Switzerland with less French than they possessed when they went there, because they had made bad use

of their time. It was the opportunity of practicing the language which ought to be given them. Hundreds and hundreds go abroad every year, but, not finding suitable company with whom they may have intercourse, they sit in libraries, copying manuscripts, or reading from morning till night, without having sufficient opportunity of speaking; if they do not worse things to kill time.

When I went abroad for the first time, about thirty years ago, I chose Geneva for my residence, a stay in France being too dangerous at that time on account of the hatred which the French bore us after the great war of 1870–71. There were plenty of German students there, who had come to French Switzerland, not to study, but to pass the first "semester" in an agreeable manner—rich men's sons who did not care a button for speaking French. I felt that their company was dangerous, and joined a French company, thus avoiding all intercourse with my countrymen. One of my friends, however, a highly gifted student but of weak character, was caught in the snares which those fellows laid for him. They were carousing every night till late in the morning; they fought their duels (for which purpose they had to go to France, as duelling is absolutely forbidden in Switzerland) losing much of their precious time by these fighting tours; the rest of the time they played cards or billiards, always speaking German of course, and laughing at the despair of the poor fellow who sometimes tried to learn and came to the courses at the university. At the end of the term my friend bade me farewell with tears in his eyes, and with the words: "What will my father say? I have forgotten all my French!"

What he did from levity is done by others out of awkwardness or shyness. For I speak of young people who go abroad for the first time, without experience of life. It was by remembering that parting scene at Geneva, and for the case of my own son, who was going to study modern philology, that I proposed a new plan of training modern-language teachers to the meeting of philologists in Breslau in 1902. According to this plan the first four or five years of study of the student of philology ought to be spent at a German university, where the development of the

language from Latin to modern French and from Anglo-Saxon to modern English is taught him. History of literature, reading of authors from all periods, and besides exercises in modern French and English surveyed by the lectors, will fill these first five years. Then he has to pass a state examination in these learned things; for a modern-language teacher has not to learn foreign languages as waiters do, who go abroad, pick up some thousand words, and often return without being able to spell the words correctly, but who speak well, though like parrots. A teacher must know the structure of the language from its origin; he must be able to give the etymology of a word, and the changes of its significations in the course of the centuries. He must be able to distinguish what is genuine in a language, what is of foreign accidence, what is good or bad style.

The examination over, the candidate places himself at the disposal of the government, who sends him abroad, not as a student to a university, but to a school, first as a hearer, then as a teacher. For I assert that the best means of learning a language is by teaching it. *Docendo discimus* was also meant for us. The French, English, and American governments send candidates from their country to Germany, who are dealt with in the same way. The young man, however, cannot begin with teaching. He is at first attached to an experienced master at the foreign school, who suffers him to attend his lessons, who gives him advice in everything in which he requires it, and who surveys and guides his first essays in teaching a class in the foreign tongue. It requires many hours of preparation to give such a lesson even to beginners. The branches of instruction best suited for a German who is to learn French or English are: German, his mother-tongue, then history and geography. Before each lesson a written plan or sketch of the subjects to be treated must be handed to the "tutor"—i. e., the foreign teacher who has to survey the candidate's lessons. If the tutor approves of this plan, or after the alterations proposed by him have been made, the lesson can begin. A great difficulty in the beginning is in the answering of the questions which the pupils will put to their youthful new teacher. As a rule he has to try to explain every-

thing in the simplest language which he can find. The ability to express himself will grow rapidly, and when a little self-confidence is acquired, things will go on quite comfortably.

There is one great danger in the beginning—the difficulty of keeping up discipline among the pupils, especially in crowded classes. This obstacle is removed first by the presence of the "tutor," who, of course, must be a man of authority, if he is suited to his office. Then we must remember that self-discipline is the best means to keep up the class-discipline: be well prepared for your lessons; don't neglect yourself in your manners and duties during the lesson; be strict in the *first* cases of disobedience, negligence, or even impudence that occur, kind and forgiving to those who repent; and you will soon lead the whole class as by a leading-string. I have found out by former experience that those who could not keep up discipline abroad could not maintain it at home either.

By causing the candidates to teach abroad we compel them to be other than mere imitators of what they have heard before, to produce new ideas, and to express them in their own way—simply, awkwardly perhaps at first, but soon gaining such skill, and power, and strength in speaking as they will never acquire elsewhere.

And what other great advantages are offered them in this way? First of all, they have acquaintances—and what excellent ones! The French *agrégé*—i. e., the professor who has passed his very difficult examinations—is generally a most amiable and chivalrous man. To him the candidate may apply if he wants help in any respect—advice in linguistic matters, the correction of an essay which he has written in the foreign language, guidance whenever he wishes to roam about the town or in the neighborhood. He is surrounded by a circle of well-bred men, whose minds are cultivated with the utmost refinement. He is never alone, at school, at the meals, especially at dinner; on his excursions he is in the company of excellent men, who are ever willing to answer his questions. And the married colleagues will invite him to their families; there the stranger may look into the place which the Frenchman keeps from other eyes—a French home.

And what linguistic treasures will the candidate bring home from abroad when he returns to his native country? Treasures which will remain stored up in his mind for years and years, and will not be so easily forgotten as the knowledge which we acquire if we are only hearers of spoken French, as it happens with those who come to study at a foreign university. I know from my own experience and that of many friends that those who taught in the foreign country are not only better skilled in the use of the foreign idiom, but they remain masters of the language for a longer time than others. When they have to teach a class in the foreign tongue, which is requisite in the two upper classes in the reform schools and *realgymnasiums*, it is as if they spoke their mother-tongue; whereas others hesitate and make blunders, and betray with every new question that they move on ground which is not familiar to them. For them, however, a visit to the foreign country is, of course, requisite, as for every man who has to teach foreign languages; for the knowledge of a modern language is an art that requires practice, like music or pistol-shooting; neglect the practice and you become a botcher. Even if they go abroad again, what great advantages have they compared with other people! The circle of their acquaintances of years ago has certainly changed, diminished, but there are enough left who will gladly receive their old colleague again and help him to recover his former mastery of the language; whereas others, not in the same situation, will lose precious time in getting acquainted with persons with whom they can converse. How often have I seen that the chief conversation of the day was restricted to people whom they met at dinner—people far inferior in rank and knowledge to themselves.

The ideas which I thus exposed to public criticism were indeed violently criticized in the beginning. One said: "If I go abroad, I don't go to work, but to rest from work; we have such an amount of labor to do here in our various functions that we want to breathe more freely when once happily launched upon the ocean of foreign customs and usages. We shall try to learn men's customs, to become acquainted with the country and the people; we ought to study the 'realism,' not only the language."

It was in vain that I tried to convince him that in the position in which I wished to see the young teacher placed he would attain those ends much more easily; he stuck to his point.

Another, a most learned but awkward professor at a university, feared lest bad customs should be introduced by the foreign teachers whom we should receive in exchange. He had apparently a dark notion of the French *agrégé* being a kind of ogre or Don Juan. "Only fancy," he exclaimed, "that a young Frenchman should be employed at a school for young ladies!" His gray head prevented me from laughing outright. There was after the first part of the debate a great probability that my motion would be dropped. All speakers declared against it. I felt rather dejected, till one of my friends said to me: "Courage, old boy; *in magnis voluisse, sat est!*" These words restored my peace of mind. And when Geheimrat Muench rose and spoke in favor of my motion, though with some amendments, my idea was victorious. Another triumph awaited it. Our emperor, certainly without knowing what I had proposed at Breslau, about one year later ordered an exchange between professors at universities. This was the same idea which I had restricted to schools, and now that the emperor's will was executed without delay, my proposal found everywhere a good reception. The government of Prussia fixed 20,000 marks a year for the execution of this plan; Saxony has followed, and the results are, I am told, excellent. What we most rejoiced at was that the emperor had chiefly in view an exchange between American and German professors. His chief end is not the knowledge of the language, but the knowledge of the nation —the great, high, divine end of drawing closer and closer together the two great countries which are already bound together by thousands of ties of policy, commerce, friendship, and respect. May the professor of the university soon be followed by the teacher of the secondary and primary school![1]

[1] A plan for the exchange of secondary-school teachers between Prussia and the United States is now being carried out under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Cf. the *Fourth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer*, 1909, pp. 45–57.—Ed. *School Review*.

A RURAL HIGH SCHOOL

L. B. HILL
Middlebourne, West Virginia

The rural phases of educational progress in West Virginia are now being emphasized more than all other phases put together. A recent law gave each board of education in each magisterial district the power to appoint a district supervisor. Last year there were nineteen district supervisors in West Virginia, and wherever the board exercised care in the selection of the supervisor, district supervision has been successful. The law also provides for the establishment of district high schools; a number of these schools have already been established in the state.

Probably the most significant single movement toward rural development is the establishment of a county high school. This school was established in Tyler County. The county has an area of three hundred square miles, and a population of eighteen thousand; it borders on the Ohio River but has only fourteen miles of river front. There is but one town of any size in the county; this is Sistersville, with a population of four thousand. It has its own high school. Middlebourne, with a population of seven hundred and fifty, is the county seat and is rather centrally located. It is also the seat of the county high school. The county has two other towns each with a four-room graded-school building, two others each with a two-room school building; in the country there are two schools with two teachers; all the other schools in the county are one-room schools.

The surface of the county is hilly, but the small valleys and hillsides are productive; it is well suited to pasturage and to raising small fruits. In 1890 oil was found, and since that time the oil and gas industry has flourished. This industry has had certain social effects. For some years the farmers ceased their activities and seemed to revel in the thought of getting rich. The increase in property valuation from 1889 to 1909 was over

six million dollars. In recent years the oil industry has declined rapidly, and the effect has been to turn the attention of the citizens toward making permanent improvements. To this end the representatives of the county secured a special act of the legislature which gave the citizens the right to vote upon the proposition to establish a county high school. The vote was taken November 6, 1906, and showed that a good majority of the citizens were in favor of establishing such a school.

According to the provisions of the act the presidents of the various district boards, six in number, became members of the county high school board; also the president of the board of the independent district of Sistersville became a member; likewise the county superintendent became president, *ex officio*, of the board. After looking about for some time the board bought five acres of ground for a building-site in the town of Middlebourne. The price paid was $5,000: the sum of $3,275 was paid by the citizens of the town by private subscription. On Monday, August 26, ground was broken for the building. At the date set for the beginning of school the building was not entirely finished; so the organization was made in the county courthouse. The school occupied these quarters for one month and then moved into its permanent home.

The brick, laid in red mortar, and the four large white Ionic columns, supporting a portico, give the building a massive appearance. It is 129 feet long by 78 feet wide, has nine classrooms, a library room, study hall, auditorium, gymnasium, office, woodshop, furnace rooms, and lavatories. The auditorium, with its elevated floor, wide stage, and dressing-rooms, furnishes ample provisions for lecture courses and entertainments. The stage is furnished with a grand piano, and the deep-paneled metal ceiling adds to the attractiveness of the room. On the first floor is a sanitary drinking-fountain; the water supply is from a large cistern. In the basement is a pressure tank which forces the water to all parts of the building. The building is heated by six gas furnaces, three in each end of the basement; by this means any one room may be heated without heating the others. The ventilating is by means of the fan system. Some

of the rooms are furnished with desks, others with tablet arm chairs. In this rural building are found most of the conveniences of the modern city high school.

On the day set for beginning the school, September 28, 1908, 42 pupils were enrolled. Of this number 24 were from the town and 18 from the country. Of those from the country most lived close enough to board at home; only 2 boarded in town. In March a special spring term was begun which was largely attended by country teachers and their pupils who were preparing to teach. This increased the total enrolment to 170 before the close of the first year. The second year began with an enrolment of 69; of these a much larger percentage are from the country than were those of the first year. Those who board in town are able to secure board and room at the rate of $2.50 or $3.00 a week. Some, who go home on Friday evening and return Monday morning, secure a still lower rate. From the beginning two courses were offered: an industrial course and a college preparatory course. The former differs from the latter in that it has German instead of Latin; it also has agriculture and manual training, and contemplates domestic science. Considerable freedom was allowed the pupil in choosing the course and also in substituting branches in one course for those in the other. It was interesting to note that a large majority of the pupils chose the college-preparatory course, and most of them steered clear of the subject of agriculture. It is still more significant to note that already there has been a marked change in sentiment; the industrial course has grown in popularity, and agriculture is now a much-favored subject. Manual training was introduced into the school as follows: Two boys were observed who were industrially inclined. These boys each had small shops and a number of tools at home. They were invited to bring their tools to the building, and a small room was set aside for a shop. Some lumber was procured out of which they made benches; during the first year they made a bookcase and a number of useful articles for the school. The boys soon observed that the room in which they were working was located immediately over one of the engines which runs the ventilating fans. They

therefore constructed a turning lathe, made a support for a jig saw, a bench for a rip saw, a frame for a grindstone, and by means of pulleys and shafting attached each of these to the engine. Other boys soon became interested, and by the time of the opening of school last fall a number of pupils were ready to elect manual training. The work is now under the direction of a teacher, and the pupils work at least six hours per week. The school furnishes the lumber, but the pupils furnish their own tools. This year in addition to their regular work they will construct some chemistry tables and cabinets, and make most of the tables and desks needed for science work. In this way an attempt is being made to correlate science and manual training.

A good lecture course is maintained by the school; this is liberally patronized by the pupils and townspeople. As yet, not many country people attend owing to the difficulty of transportation. Literary societies, baseball teams, and tennis clubs are well organized. In the spring the classes in agriculture will try their hand at school gardens. Also a corn contest for the entire county will be conducted under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, the object being to interest the farmers and their sons more intensely in agriculture, and indirectly to draw their attention toward the high school.

Sixteen units are necessary for graduation in each course. This year there will be a graduating class of sixteen, although this is only the second year of the school's existence. This is possible because the town school had been giving two years of high-school work previous to the organization of the county high school. In regard to the selection of teachers a liberal policy was inaugurated by the board, only college graduates being selected. At present there are three assistants to the principal besides a special teacher of music and drawing. Most of these have done considerable graduate work.

Before the school was organized it was thought necessary to educate public sentiment in favor of the high school. The principal secured lantern slides of high-school buildings, of high-school work, and made others showing the cost and value of a high-school education. He then made a tour of the county. He

found that the chief objections to the movement came from a misunderstanding of the meaning of a high school and from false reports concerning the cost of this particular building. However, the sentiment among the country people for a higher education was beyond what one might expect to find. A second tour was made just before the beginning of the second year, when it was found that public sentiment had much improved; that the people were beginning to find out what a high school really meant and were becoming its ardent supporters. The large number of pupils in attendance during the spring term, representing all parts of the county, took good reports to their homes; these reports helped much toward creating a favorable sentiment.

It is early in the history of the school to speak of the influence it will have upon the rural schools. But already certain results are evident. The special term last spring was "tacked on" for the benefit of those who had been teaching in the rural schools. Extra teachers were added, and the common-school branches, together with some of the first-year high-school subjects, were given. Many of those who attended are again teaching in the rural schools. It is found that these teachers have carried the high-school spirit into the remotest parts of the county, that they are instilling into the minds of the country boys and girls the idea of entering high school and completing the course of study; that many of them are now teaching the elements of agriculture, music, and drawing, who never would have attempted these subjects had it not been for their three months' training in the high school. Of course these teachers should have much more work in order to manage these subjects successfully; yet their enthusiasm insures us that they will take more work by and by.

The question naturally arises whether this is the proper type of school for rural communities. Our experience leads us to say that for some it is and for some it is not. A smaller unit, such as the magisterial district, is probably better than the county, provided such a unit can furnish means for supporting a good high school. It will bring the school closer to the homes of the boys and girls. But many districts are not able financially to

support high schools without an unreasonably high rate upon the taxable property, whereas with the county as the unit and each district contributing its share the financial problem is easily met. In Tyler County there are six magisterial districts, with a total property valuation of over sixteen million dollars. Thus this county can support a high school at a very reasonable rate of taxation. But no one district in the county could support a school of its own without a tax rate higher than the citizens are willing to pay. It is evident that some districts in some counties will be able to maintain schools of their own while others will not; this places the poor district at a decided disadvantage. Hence we believe that in most cases where the county is not too large it is best to have one good high school centrally located. This insures more money for the school, and as a result a larger and better teaching staff, greater variety in the course of study, and a wider association for the pupils.

LIBRARY READING IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

IV

PERSONAL GUIDANCE

MARGARET ASHMUN
Department of English, University of Wisconsin

After all, in the library-reading work, it is the individual guidance which really counts. The teacher can do her best for her classes only when she has been long enough in the school to know each pupil personally, together with his home influences, his tastes, and his possibilities. Since this condition is perfectly attainable only in the smaller high schools, it would seem to follow that the most excellent results may be secured in villages, and towns of no great size, where the personal contact of teacher and pupil is the easy and usual thing. Such is actually the case. A genuine delight in reading and a real, if rudimentary, satisfaction in the finest kinds of literature can be best developed where there is a book-loving teacher, and a group of boys and girls whom she knows and understands. Nevertheless, in any school, large or small, much individual work can be done. To this end, the teacher should study her pupils, and strive to adapt herself most constantly to their varying natures and needs.

There are diverse types of students with whom one has to deal. The one which comes most spontaneously to mind is the freshman or sophomore boy who reads lurid tales of the *Diamond Dick* order, or who revels in the fantastic lucubrations of Kirk Munroe and Harry Castlemon. Now, there is nothing particularly alarming in a small boy's taste for books of the kind just indicated. It simply means that he is a boylike boy, who has a liking for the concrete, and loves action, and energy, and heroism, as he properly should. He has not yet discovered that the qualities which he admires in a piece of reading may be found in a more literary guise than in the *Diamond Dick* books. His companions are zealous in supplying him with their pyrotechnic

literature, and because the pamphlets are cheap, and accessible, and illustrated, he himself buys and exchanges with his friends. If parents and teachers used the same methods, with better books, they might perhaps create somewhat as vital an interest. At any rate, when a boy who reads dime novels finds his way into a library-reading class, he is a problem which has to be met frankly and intelligently. One cannot transfer a healthy boy from *Six-Fingered Mike, The Cowboy King,* to George Eliot's *Middlemarch,* and expect on his part very enthusiastic acceptance of the change. It will be a long time before he really relishes "standard books." It is hard for grown-up people to remember that the love for literature is a plant of slow growth, and that their own tastes have been an "uncertain" number of years in maturing. Have patience with the lad with a fondness for the lurid, and be careful not to condemn his likes and dislikes. Do not scold him because he is what he is. Accept his mental status, and try him on *Treasure Island,* or *Phroso,* or *The Virginian,* or any other good or fairish piece of work with plenty of conversation in it, along with a large allowance of blood-letting, and "swash-buckling," and hairbreadth escapes. Little by little, he will come to read, and willingly, too, a quality of literature, not equal, of course, to the masterpieces, but in its way worthy and acceptable. He will still read Henty occasionally, and will sometimes fall back on Oliver Optic for refreshment, but such authors will not hurt him in the least, provided that he has acquired an outlook toward something better. "I have to read one of those books about once in three months now," said a bright boy who was learning to eschew the Castlemon style of writings, "but I think that pretty soon I can get along without them altogether." And he did without any difficulty, in the course of a year.

The sentimental girl who loves the Duchess, and Mary J. Holmes, one is likely to find in one's classes. Pursue with her the same tactics of toleration that have been indicated above. Lead her by the lure of semi-sentimental books toward something more healthful and virile. It may be necessary to begin with Rosa N. Carey and Edna Lyall, but perhaps one need not go that far down the line. *The Princess Aline* is a well-written and

attractive book that girls will read with interest. The same may be said of Mrs. Barr's *A Bow of Orange Ribbon*, and Blanche Willis Howard's *One Summer*. Expecting no sudden transformations, provide plenty of easy reading, abounding in cheerful and honest sentiment (not sentimentalism), and almost any girl will soon become reconciled to sane and sensible literature.

The boy (or sometimes it is a girl) who, from sheer stupidity, or from love of action, does not care to read at all, is a harder problem. Reading aloud, by the teacher, will often serve to stimulate the unliterary person to finish the story for himself. Try such boys on short books that require little effort, and brief concentration, like *The Trail of the Sand Hill Stag*, or *Watchers of the Camp-Fire*. The girl will read *The Madonna of the Tubs*, *Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch*, *The Casting Away of Mrs. Lecks and Mrs. Aleshine*. Do not let these unfortunate scorners of books attempt anything long, or dry, or complicated. Simple, straightforward narrative, with much conversation, and a modicum of humor will usually win them, and engender in their hearts a toleration for reading that may develop later into something creditable and unexpectedly literary.

On the other hand, there is a type that exists in every school—the pupil who reads too much, even of passably good literature. He neglects his other work, ruins his eyesight, and fails to take the outdoor exercise essential for his best development. It is the teacher's task, in a measure accordant to the pupil's age and the quality of the books he is reading, to restrain his passion for literature within reasonable bounds. It will probably be better for him to read fewer books but those of a more solid nature. If he is reading only fiction, even tolerably good, one may tempt him to essays, and travel, and history of the style bordering on fiction, or written in an easy, conversational way. *My Summer in a Garden*, *Travels with a Donkey*, *Silverado Squatters*, and Parkman's historical series will usually appeal to children who read easily. If the pupil reads too much, even of non-fiction, as is sometimes, though rarely, the case, the teacher can simply make his reading still more solid. There are exceptionally bright high-school boys who will read with eagerness Darwin's *Origin of*

Species, Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature,* and other books on kindred subjects. They would, if their attention were not called to these volumes, go on devouring an endless number of less valuable books.

Once in a while, one meets an omnivorous reader of the brilliant, absorptive type, who instinctively chooses the best, and who reads an amount that, if required, would appall the ordinary pupil to the point of heart-failure. It seems best, as a rule, to let such a pupil take his course, interfering as little as possible, suggesting a suitable book now and then, and relying upon nature to strike a happy balance.

It would be possible to go on enumerating the different kinds of personalities to be dealt with; but the truth is, every child is really a type of his own. The greatest defect of the present educational system is that it tries to reduce every individual to the dead level of the commonplace. Every child is expected to do exactly the same thing, in exactly the same way. Here, at least, in the library-reading work, is an opportunity to differentiate. One pupil can do what he is ready and able to, regardless of what another is doing. Allowances can always be made for individual weakness, and individual strength. The most abiding satisfaction which the teacher can find in the work is the consciousness that it can be made to contribute directly and personally to the development of every pupil in her classes.

DISCUSSION

ON THE TEACHING OF CIVICS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

Some high schools teach civics only as a part of history, that is, with, by, and through history; some, as a part of the American history course, but separated, temporarily isolated, as it were, for six weeks, when a class in American history reaches the so-called critical or constitutional period; some give the last three weeks of the history class to civics; some give one semester to American history and one semester to civics; a few schools give no separate courses in American history, but give one whole year to civics, on alternate days, counting as a half-unit of credit. My purpose is to lay stress upon the insistent demand for the study of politics and government, not only as a part of but in addition to the study of history, as a separate course.

There is need of a spirit that shall not despise a true utilitarianism in the study of history. Some point of view and selection is necessary. "Politics," said Sir John Seeley, "are vulgar when they are not liberalized by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relation to practical politics." But to teach civics merely by and through history is too much like spending time on mathematics when in Greek history we reach Euclid's time, or on astronomy when the class in European history reaches the time of Galileo. Politics demands a monopoly of a history course, or it demands an exclusive sphere of its own. It must have the latter, as it cannot and should not have the former. We cannot stop to turn the history class into a class for the careful, detailed study of government, the civil and political rights and duties of a citizen.

But if the young American in the high school had to choose between history and civics, I would rather have him know *what* things are, and *how* they *work*, and *what* they are *for* in politics and government in the present, than what men did and how they did it in the past. In mechanics a workman must know how the machinery works rather than who invented the various parts and processes. Even so should the American citizen, a workman and participant in government, know and understand its mechanism and how to keep it burnished for the general good. Then we should have in this democracy scientific men in government and politics as we already have in electricity and bridge-building.

Now, though the element of speculation is exposed to error and to fancy, I believe that it has a place in a high-school class in civics; the thinking process should begin with the young that they may put their propositions through the crucible test of time in further thinking in the

college and the university. University instructors in political science complain that students do not exhibit any signs of experience in thinking. In a political science course on the American federal government the student takes the first few lectures on the meaning and correct use of the words "state," "government," "confederation," "federal union," "alliance," and then in a weekly quiz he is utterly helpless when asked to apply these terms to certain periods of our history or to illustrate and explain their applications by pointing out elements of strength and weakness as known in the terms themselves and as facts of our historical experience. I believe that this is the natural result of the very common failure of our high-school history and civics teachers to discuss theories in connection with, before, and after facts.

Those who oppose subordinating history to political science believe that political science from the point of view of the investigation and comparison of existing systems of government is a useful study for the young. What they oppose in political science is the danger of its so absorbing history as to make us teach and study history from the point of view of existing political institutions, and thus most certainly bias the search for truth, as always happens when it is subordinated to the proving of any special theory. This objection makes necessary the separation in the high school of the serious study of civics from the serious study of history, to be followed by a pursuit of political science in the university.

I am forced to believe that the present situation will not be improved until in addition to the correct study of history, especially English and American history, with proper attention to the relations of facts and theory, conditions and conclusions, causes and effects, every high school shall also give a separate and strong course in civics, with opportunity for the acquirement of correct elementary conceptions of conditions as they now are, of how they came to be, and of how they are tending for the future.

HARRY T. NIGHTINGALE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS ACADEMY

DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION OF THE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS

One of the administrative questions coming to the front in the larger high schools of the country is that of department heads, on which but little material can be found in our educational journals. This contribution, bearing mainly on the unique experiment in Washington, is offered in the hope of bringing out data from additional cities. Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Louisville, Atlanta, and San Francisco have taken tentative steps along this line. A system fairly typical of all of these contains seven groups: English, mathematics, history, science, ancient languages,

modern languages, and technical branches; but in all these the organization of the departments is confined to each school. In Washington, however, it has been the aim to unify the work in the five white high schools (and similarly in the two colored schools) by extending the authority of the department head through all these institutions. The conception has been of very gradual growth, following on the expansion of the high schools. At first there was only one high school, the rest having started as offshoots with only a few pupils and less than a dozen instructors. The influence of the parent school was indefinitely and loosely retained, without any formal authorization. Then the office of director of all five schools was created by the Board of Education, and the principal of the Central High School appointed to this post. Naturally, as his supervision widened, so did that of the embryo department heads in the original school, though of course in a much less degree. In 1906 a bill passed by Congress provided that all the subjects in the one technical, one commercial, and three *academic* schools should be classified under "eight departments." The Board made the following groups: English, mathematics, history, physics, chemistry, and biology, ancient languages, modern languages, and business. The duties of the department heads were not defined, but they were to act as educational advisers to the principals, being inferior in authority to these on all questions. But as in the case of many other laws apparently clear in terms, the enforcement has disclosed ambiguities and inconsistencies to such an extent that friction and complications have resulted. Still, so far as the writer knows, this is the most advanced effort made to unify the work in the several secondary schools of a city system. It is hoped that experiments with departments in other places will be published so that material can be available for study.

C. MERIWETHER

WASHINGTON, D. C.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Previous editorials have been devoted to the consideration of the problem of the control of the secondary school and to an attempt to bring out the historic factors which are operative in the present situation. If what has been said is true, we should be in a position to make constructive suggestions as to the way out of the difficulty. As a necessary preliminary step in the direction of positive recommendation we may lay down several considerations which must guide us in attempting to find a practicable solution of our problem.

THE WAY OUT

At the outset, therefore, we must recognize the fact that the burden of proof rests on those who would bring about the desired transfer of control. We must have something to offer. Mere protest, however well founded, if we may judge by the past, will avail little or nothing. Nor is it enough to feel strongly; we must see clearly and act firmly. Moreover, the present situation is not the deliberate making of any college or group of colleges. No one has gone about it to gain or to keep control of the secondary school for the sake of mere control. From the standpoint of the college, the prescribing of entrance requirements and the setting of entrance examinations have been the means of securing a much-needed division of labor. The college must be able to count on something, to begin somewhere, if it is to accomplish anything worth while. In the absence of any definite programme or offering from the secondary school, it is but natural that the college should prescribe what it could use and therefore would accept. Furthermore, it is but fair to note that until recently the college was, all things considered, better able to determine the curriculum of the secondary school than the unorganized body of poorly trained teachers who devoted themselves temporarily to the work of secondary education. The fault of the college is not that it met past exigencies as they arose but that it now fails to recognize that the day when its control was necessary and therefore tolerable has passed. Our secondary schools are in the hands of executive officers and teachers who, in the main, have had the same kind of scholarly preparation as the teachers in our colleges. And they are dealing directly with the problems of secondary education, as many, if not most, of our college teachers have not had the opportunity to do. In a scientific age like our own, it ought to be sufficient merely to call attention to this fact.

FUTILITY OF MERE PROTEST

In suggesting, therefore, the steps to be taken to secure immediate relief for the secondary schools by effecting a transfer of control to the officers and teachers of these schools, it will be well to lay down three principles of procedure, to which all interested ought to be able to subscribe.

PRINCIPLES OF PROCEDURE

1. We must make haste slowly. If secondary school men really believe

what they so often assert, that the colleges dominate the situation for them, they must also recognize that this domination is a form of control for which some immediate and adequate substitute must be found. The colleges must not be called upon *just to let go*. The ensuing confusion and waste would be intolerable. The transfer must be made item by item under the strictest supervision and with the co-operation of all concerned.

2. We must adopt an educational point of view. It would probably be urged by defenders of the present system that it represents an educational point of view. Perhaps in a general sense this is true. Happily, however, in the course of the last century, particularly in the field of elementary education, there has been worked out a pretty definite conception of what we mean by educational in a strict sense of the term. This meaning has been suggested in a previous editorial. In fact we need not ask for anything better in the way of a working standpoint than to have the existing philosophy of elementary education with the obviously necessary adaptations taken as the basis for the reconstruction of our secondary school practice. The cardinal points of that philosophy are the insistence that the content of the curriculum shall have meaning for the children, shall contribute to their development, and shall reveal to them the world in which their life is to go on. So for the secondary school we demand that this same philosophy shall become dominant. This, then, is an educational point of view for secondary education, that the criteria for the organization of the curriculum and the determination of method shall be derived from those disciplines and sciences which are revealing to us the marvelous unfolding that takes place in every youth during the four years of the secondary school.

3. We must employ the experimental method. It is pertinent here to insist that there is a narrower and a looser use of this term, both of which are legitimate, the only distinction being one of degree. We need not wait for action until our new movement in experimental education shall have solved all or most of our problems. Experimenting is simply trying to see what can be done, with the best available control of conditions and the best attainable test of results. Its object is that we may not leave the attainment of progress to the play of blind forces and mere chance. We can think out what we believe should be done and then try it to see if it ought to be done. It is just because the secondary school is prevented under present conditions from performing this prime educational function that relief must be had. What the colleges can do to afford this relief will be suggested in the next number of the *Review*.

W. B. O.

BOOK REVIEWS

American Education. By A. S. DRAPER.. With an introduction by NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. Pp. x+383. $2.00 net.

The author of this volume has been a conspicuous leader in American education for a quarter of a century at least. He has had unusually wide experience as an administrator, alike of elementary and of higher educational systems. As a public speaker upon educational questions he has had few equals in this country, and he has been called upon constantly to address teachers as well as laymen upon a great variety of subjects relating to teaching, from the kindergarten to the graduate school of the university. The volume before us comprises tweny-six addresses dealing with problems of organization and administration, and with teaching in the elementary school, the secondary school, the college, and the university. In addition there are included seven addresses upon various subjects of a general character such as "The Spirit of the Teacher," "The Schools and International Peace," "The Farm and the School," "Public Morals and Public Schools," etc. In reading these addresses one realizes that some of them were delivered quite recently, while others were written a number of years ago, and have not been brought down to date in every detail. Certain criticisms upon tendencies in our schools are hardly applicable to present-day conditions. For instance, the author neglects no opportunity to make sport of certain phases of the child-study movement in its inception. He condemns the collecting of statistics upon unimportant topics by teachers in service, and he derides the questionnaire method of solving educational problems. This criticism seems to be of importance mainly for historical purposes, since the practices complained of have almost entirely disappeared from American schools.

Mr. Draper's point of view is, of course, that of the administrator. He views American education as a whole. He has been interested in solving problems connected with making great complex systems work. His attention has not been attracted strongly to the detailed problems connected with teaching in the classroom, or even with the making of a curriculum, though problems pertaining to studies in elementary and secondary schools receive some attention in this volume. But one feels that what might be called the scientific processes of teaching does not get the expert handling which is very evident in the treatment of questions of organization and supervision, particularly of large educational systems. When the author discusses "unsettled questions" he does not think at all of the problems which would first occur to the teacher who is trying to make his instruction in any particular subject effective, or who is struggling to find out what the nature of the children before him is, when they naturally become interested in different studies, whether it would be better to restrain them absolutely in the schoolroom or to give them a large measure of freedom, and so on *ad libitum*. It is interesting to speculate on what such

men as President Hall, and Professors Dewey, Thorndike, Bagley, DeGarmo, Suzzallo, Snedden, Kirkpatrick, Horne, McMurry, Miller, Swift, Scott, Hanus, Chamberlain, and other writers on education would set down as "unsettled questions" in teaching. It is certain they would not think of most of the questions which alone have attracted the attention of Mr. Draper. This simply shows how vastly complex our American educational work has become, for all these problems of administration as well as those of actual instruction are, of course, of immense importance.

The present writer feels that Mr. Draper's book interprets the general ideals of American education, regarded from an administrative point of view, more effectively and pleasingly than has been done heretofore. The style of the book is cultivated and at the same time dynamic. The treatment throughout is concrete and to the point. There is no soaring into the air, or declaiming for the sake simply of making a noise in the world. The impression the book as a whole and in detail makes on one is that the author is talking "horse sense," at least most of the time. Of course, he is conservative. Men who are responsible for administering great systems are bound to look with suspicion upon revolutionary suggestions. Once the machinery is got going, the business of the administrator is mainly to resist innovations which might throw it out of order. The man who is working on the inside with some little part of the machinery often thinks a change would be a good thing. He can see that improvements could be made in the tools he is handling, and he does not stop to consider what would happen to the machine as a whole if the changes he desires should be made. But the superintendent of the entire plant does not want to take the chances of having to remodel his whole establishment if he should change any particular part thereof. The radicals in American education are not as a rule the administrators; at least not the men who have to deal with such large systems as Mr. Draper has had to do.

While conservative in tone, still there is manifest throughout this book a spirit of progress. The ideals presented are sane and virile; and so far as the present writer can tell, they represent truly the general character and spirit of our educational philosophy. But it ought to be noted that whenever Mr. Draper touches upon educational problems of a scientific character he shows he is wandering in unfamiliar regions. For instance, in discussing coeducation he says (p. 228) that there are no differences between men and women which should make their education divergent. "Physiological, psychological, and social difficulties exist only in imagination." Now, in the light of present-day biological, psychological, and sociological science, such a statement as this makes one pause. But propositions of this sort are to be looked for perhaps from those who deal with things in the large, and who have neither the patience, the disposition, nor the desire to work them out in a detailed, scientific way.

The only other views which Mr. Draper expresses, and which seem to the present writer to show misunderstanding and even prejudice, are those which relate to the child-study movement, already referred to. One could not expect a person of Mr. Draper's temperament and interests to be much in love with the methods of child-study; but it might reasonably be expected that he would be willing to recognize the beneficial results which have already issued from that movement. Mr. Draper's point of view is largely historical, which

adds greatly to the clarity, sanity, and helpfulness of his treatment of educational questions. One cannot help wondering then why he does not see that the work in child-study which he ridicules has already produced profound changes in the theory of American education, and also in its practice in many sections of the country. That movement has set in operation forces which are transforming American schools in respect to the actual processes of teaching. Of course, the movement has not much influenced the administration of education, as Mr. Draper has been interested in it. It has had to deal with minute details, wherein lie the real secrets of success in teaching. To one who is dealing with matters in a big way, this minute work seems trivial. But right here has been the chief trouble with education from Plato down. Men have been unwilling to apply themselves to the detection of those infinitesimal factors which in co-operation lead to success or failure in education. Mr. Draper's treatment of this subject is wholly unsatisfactory, and out of accord with the general spirit and method of his book, which so effectively shows how our present system has come to be what it is.

M. V. O'SHEA

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Laggards in Our Schools: A Study of Retardation and Elimination in City School Systems. By LEONARD P. AYRES. New York: Charities Publication Co., 1909. Pp. 120. $1.50.

This is a book which all school superintendents and principals should have within easy access for ready reference and reading, and it contains many valuable conclusions with which every teacher should be familiar. It is the second of a series of "backward children investigations" published by the Russell Sage Foundation, which undertook in the fall of 1907 to study "the adaptability of the school and its grades to children." The predominant interest of the investigation "was not in the individual, subnormal, or atypical child, but rather in the large class, varying with local conditions from 5 to 75 per cent. of all the children in our schools, who are older than they should be for the grades they are in." The object was to answer the questions, "How many of the children in our schools fail to make normal progress from grade to grade, and why do they fail? How many of the children drop out of school before finishing the elementary course, and why do they drop out? What are the facts and what are the remedies?" This present volume discusses these questions under the general headings: (1) "Conditions," (2) "Causes," and (3) "Remedies."

The subjects discussed under "Conditions" are retardation—"retarded children are those who are older than they should be for the grades in which they are found"—and elimination—"the falling out of children before completing the course." Chap. ii calls attention to the significance of these problems and gives in general the method of studying the relative distribution of the 1,982,477 children enrolled in the public schools of fifty-eight cities of the United States.

Chap. iii discusses factors affecting grade distribution. Allowing for the

factors of death and increase in numbers of each succeeding generation, it is estimated that for every 871 eighth-grade pupils there would be 1,000 first-grade or seven-year-old pupils. Some other factors affecting the distribution are local conditions, such as the existence of a floating population, with transference of pupils, and immigration. The factor of elimination is important, and the conclusion is reached, "In the elementary school 10 per cent. of the children will have left at thirteen years of age, 40 per cent. will have left by fourteen, half of the remainder at fifteen, and again half of these at the age of sixteen." The general tendency for our schools is to carry all of the children through the fifth grade and about one-tenth through the high school, as is shown later.

The difficult problem of the extent of retardation in different systems of schools is taken up in chap. iv. Attention is called to the work of Dr. Cornman and Dr. Falkner. Dr. Greenwood's criticism of Dr. Cornman's method of computing retardation by the age and grade figures is also discussed. This is the method adopted, modified, and expanded in the book under discussion, because for one reason the data for the method proposed by Mr. Greenwood—"the time it takes to do a year's work"—were not available. Using the city of Memphis as an example, and accepting as "normal ages" six to eight years for the first grade, seven to nine for the second, and so on, we find that out of 2,053 children in the first grade, 572 or 27.8 per cent. were retarded; of the 392 in the eighth grade, 193 or 49.2 per cent. were retarded; or, for this city-school system of eight grades, 51.3 per cent. of the pupils were retarded. The colored children (apparently for all grades) showed 75.8 per cent. retarded. If we neglect the effect of the time of year when the statistics were gathered, Medford heads the list with only 7.5 per cent. retarded; Boston is listed with 18.5 per cent., Philadelphia with 36.8 per cent., Los Angeles with 38.3 per cent., etc., the average for thirty-one cities being 33.7 per cent.

"What proportion of the children who enter the first grade continue to the eighth?" This is the question discussed in chap. v. The first important problem is, how many children enter the first grade, for the number in the first grade is not the number of beginners. "It contains those who entered this year and all the retarded pupils." So also does the second grade, the third, and so on. How may we find the number of beginners? This is Mr. Ayres's question. His answer is as follows: "The number of children beginning school each year is approximately equal to the average of the generations of the ages seven to twelve in the school membership of the system." The first grade has on an average a membership of 173 per cent. of the annual number of beginners.

Chap. vi discusses the wide variance between the above results and those given in the statistical report of the Bureau of Education, especially the report of Professor Thorndike, whose computations are however based on a study of several cities not included in Mr. Ayres's report. Chap. vii takes up the rate of progress, and maintains that for the average child it requires ten years to pass through the eight grades of the average city-school system, and that from "available data it appears safe to say that for every pupil making rapid progress there are from eight to ten making slow progress."

The pupil who repeats the school year is called "a repeater." Chap. viii discusses the money cost of the repeater. Chap. ix again calls attention to the causes of leaving school, referring to work, ill health, etc. Chap. x,

on the nationality factor, says: "There is no evidence that cities having the largest foreign population have the highest percentages of retardation and elimination."

Physical defects and school progress are discussed in chap. xi, which is full of instructive and suggestive material. "Physical defects decrease with age. . . . . Vision does not follow the same general rule as other defects. . . . . New York examinations show higher percentages of enlarged glands, defective breathing, hypertrophied tonsils, and adenoids among dull children than among bright children."

The next three chapters are concerned with irregular attendance, promotions, the sex factor, and age. The conclusions here are, "Retardation among boys is 13 per cent. more prevalent than among girls," and therefore "our schools as they now exist are better fitted to the needs and natures of the girl than of the boy pupils. . . . . Children who make the most rapid progress through the grades are those who start late, and those who make the slowest progress are those who start early."

Some rather meager statistics are given in chap. xvi to show that the conditions are improving, and a comparative method of testing the efficiency of public schools is outlined in chap. xvii. Under chap. xviii we have a brief discussion of compulsory attendance, school census, grading, special classes, physical defects, transfers, and promotions. That our schools are weakest upon the administrative side is shown in chap. xix. The final chapter calls attention to the effect of retardation on society.

This book contains the results of much research and shows evidence of a comprehensive knowledge of statistical methods. It is essential for the reader to keep in mind that the author is "outlining problems, testing methods, and developing a system of more extensive work" by using such material as is available from present records and reports, and that consequently some of the problems are treated in a general manner, though the book is in no sense a popular treatise.

On the other hand, it does not seem unfair to say that the reader is surprised to find that no consideration is made for the wide range of requirements in regard to compulsory school attendance and frequency of promotions, that a careful distinction is not always made between retarded pupils and repeaters (cf. pp. 26, 27), and that occasionally certain tentative conclusions which have been drawn for a special purpose are at other times accepted as general conclusions. For example in chap. iv, where statistics on retardation are gathered from thirty-one cities, the time at which they were gathered varies greatly and would greatly modify results. The author then states, "Retardation figures from the different cities are only comparable when based on figures gathered by the same method." Comparative percentages follow. These are used as general conclusions at the end of the chapter, and also on p. 3. (These conclusions have been stated at the end of the fourth paragraph of this review.)

Dr. Luther H. Gulick, under whose direction the report was published, states in the Introduction that the most important results of the backward children investigation, of which this is the second report, are: "(1) that the most important causes of retardation of school children can be removed; (2) that the old-fashioned virtues of regularity of attendance and faithfulness are major

elements of success; (3) that some cities are already accomplishing excellent results by measures that can be adopted by all; (4) that relatively few children are so defective as to prevent success in school or life."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO BIRD T. BALDWIN

The Syntax of High-School Latin: Statistics and Selected Examples Arranged under Grammatical Headings and in Order of Occurrence by Fifty Collaborators. Edited by LEE BYRNE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. ix+54. $0.83 postpaid.

In this book Mr. Byrne, with the help of a large number of collaborators, has endeavored to count and tabulate for each book or oration every construction occurring in the average high-school Latin, covering the same field as Mr. Lodge in his Vocabulary of *High-School Latin,* except that (wisely, in my judgment), he includes only four books of Caesar, not five. Statistics are given, notes on categories, a proposed distribution in the course of study, selected examples for each construction, and the same examples in the order of their occurrence—and all this in the brief compass of fifty-four pages. In the exhibition of the examples, Mr. Byrne, following the general style of Mr. Lodge's treatment, has put into bold-faced type the constructions occurring as many as five times in Caesar, into ordinary type those additional constructions which occur five times in Cicero, and into small capitals the new constructions occurring five times in Virgil. The purpose of the whole is to suggest to teachers a reasonable reduction, through the omission of rare constructions, in the total number dwelt upon in high-school work, and an order in which emphasis shall be laid upon those which are taken up. The editor rightly thinks that completeness in the high school may go too far, and defeat its own ends. The spirit of the whole is summed up in the Introduction, in a sentence taken from President Butler: "Details relatively of little value, save in so far as these are absolutely necessary to enable the student to read intelligently, are out of place in secondary education."

The plan is altogether admirable.[1] The book should be in the hands of all teachers, and especially of college instructors who make examination papers in translation, composition, or grammar.

But I do not regard the work as final. Too many persons have been engaged upon it to allow a strictly uniform system to be possible. Moreover, it is too condensed. It does not seem to me wise, for example, to include the

[1] I appreciate it all the more, because some of the younger scholars connected with my work were engaged upon a similar plan, in which I was taking part. So, more notably, Mr. W. L. Carr, formerly of the Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, now of the University High School, The University of Chicago, whose name appears frequently under the mention of the individual subjects in Mr. Bryne's preface, and Miss Frances E. Sabin, of the High School at Oak Park, Ill., who, when a graduate student at the University of Chicago, eight years ago prepared a complete classification of all the subjunctives in the seven books of the *Gallic War,* on the basis of the Hale-Buck syntax, giving all the examples in full.

subjective genitive with the possessive, or the appositional with the genitive of material, as has been done. In the same way, the ablative with *opus est*, the ablative with *fretus*, and the ablative with *nitor*, are hidden away, without explicit mention, under some more general heads. One cannot even know what the respective heads are, since grammarians differ about the nature of the constructions (thus the ablative with *nitor* is put by Harkness, Gildersleeve and Lodge, and Bennett, under means, while Allen and Greenough and I find it to be locative). It would have been easy to give the actual number of occurrences (thus *opus est* 1 Caesar, 0 Cicero, *fretus*, 1 Caesar, 3 Cicero [2 in one place], *nitor* 2 Caesar [in one place], 0 Cicero); and these low figures, if given, might have helped to keep examiners from calling for these constructions, as they have frequently done, in the elementary composition papers. Moreover, I should not put the ablative of accordance with specification, with which, in my opinion, it has nothing whatever in common. The mere fact that, while the Allen-Greenough and Gildersleeve-Lodge grammars class accordance under this head, Bennett classes it under manner, Harkness under cause, and I under the separative ablative[2] is a sufficient reason for giving the figures for it separately; and, in any case, it would have been well to inform readers just how frequently this type of construction is found.

Quamquam is entered as occurring once in Caesar. It should have been stated that the word does not appear in the manuscripts, and that most of the German editors of Caesar emend iv. 3 in some other way.

Further, there are certain errors. Thus conditions contrary to fact are put down as not occurring in Caesar; but they do occur (in indirect discourse, but none the less genuinely and with no less importance) three times, namely *si . . . . fuisset*, i. 14; *si . . . . vellet*, i. 14, and *si . . . . esset*, i. 34. Thus, again, the genitive with *miseret*, etc., is listed as occurring eleven times in *Aen.* i–vi. But the references in my article on "Composition," p. 232 of this issue of the *School Review*, show thirteen occurrences.

The book suffers from the unscientific and unsettled character of our terminology and views. Thus the subjunctive in *domi nihil erat quo famem tolerarent*, *B.G.* i. 28, is classed on p. 39 under "characteristic." It is, indeed, so explained by a number of the editors. But the Allen and Greenough, Bennett, and Westcott editions class the example under purpose, while the Johnston and Sanford edition, in accord with my syntax, says "best taken as potential" (i.e., as meaning "there was nothing with which they could relieve their hunger"—a construction with exact parallels in Greek, old Persian, Sanskrit, and Avestan). Such differences lower the value of the statistics, in default of a statement of the author's position, with a list of the places involved. Again, the author follows the accepted, but monstrous, scheme by which *all* subjunctive questions, no matter how widely the corresponding non-interrogative ideas would vary, are classed as "deliberative"—as if all kinds of subjunctive ideas but one *changed their nature* the moment they are put interrogatively. Thus *quis cladem illius noctis . . . . explicet*, *Aen.* ii. 362, which is only a rhetorical way of saying "no one *could* set forth in words the slaughter of that night," is classed on p. 37

[2] I find the conception to be that of the habit, institution, etc., *from which* the individual act proceeds (compare *consuetudine* and *ex consuetudine* in Caesar, *more*, *ex more*, and *de more* in Virgil).

as expressing deliberation! In point of fact, only two out of the ten selected examples of the deliberative really belong under this head.

I should be sorry, however, to close my review by taking exceptions, and wish rather to insist that the book stands for a sound tendency, and that nothing else so detailed or so trusty yet exists.

W. G. HALE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Distribution and Function of Mental Imagery. By GEORGE HERBERT BETTS. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1909. Pp. 99.

This book, presumably a Doctor's thesis, begins by investigating with the questionnaire method the capacity to obtain images in the principal departments of sense. The questionnaire method used is similar to Galton's but more searching and extended. The subjects were students of Cornell College, Iowa, extension classes of Teachers College, New York, and eighteen trained psychologists. Vision was found to be no better than the other senses. Smell and taste, usually thought to be much poorer than the others, were found to have as vivid imagery as vision. In general the various kinds were found to be much more evenly distributed than has been commonly thought.

The second and main part of the book has to do with the occurrence and use of imagery when the purpose is to think on some topic. The author disregards all enunciatory images because of the difficulty of discriminating between them and actual sensations. This is unfortunate, because the book turns out to be an argument in favor of imageless thought and the purely incidental character of much of our imagery. An enunciatory account is necessary to the proof. In thinking the opposites of ten words one-half of the 500 responses were accompanied by no images (except possibly enunciatory), and one-third were accompanied by images which came too late to have been instrumental in suggesting the correct word. When the task was to image for ten seconds what would be seen in the bed of the Atlantic Ocean were the water to disappear, 27 per cent. of the responses were not accompanied by images and in about 25 per cent. the images came too late to have been a cause. There were two other tests of this character, one on auditory imagery and one on gustatory, with similar results. Students were asked whether in reading their favorite pieces of literature they had images (and if so, of what kinds and how many), or whether they only felt or knew or understood the meaning of the piece. The results showed in general, according to the author, that a very large part of our thinking is either devoid of imagery or accompanied by imagery which is only incidental. In the literature test a great deal of imagery was shown to accompany the reading of the literature, but the images played only a small part in the appreciation, the mind loving to dwell on the meaning, feeling, etc.

The results, so far as they concern imageless thought and the incidental character of images, are not convincing to the reviewer. Only trained psychologists (for example graduate students in psychology) should have been used as subjects, and at least an attempt should have been made to take account of *all* the imagery which occurred. If it is easy, as the author says, to detect

the mere *presence* of imagery, why are psychologists divided on the question of the existence of imageless thought? In some cases the author decides whether the images were essential and relevant or incidental by looking over a list of images written by the subject. The subjects alone can determine this. Many an image would look irrelevant to an outsider which was full of meaning, quite decidedly pertinent, to the thinker who knew all its connections. In the literature test the author asks the subjects whether it is the images or the meaning that they love to dwell upon, and concludes, because they say the latter, that the images are incidental. Would they have had the meaning without the images? If, as seems probable, meaning consists of images (and percepts) in relation, and if the termini of the relations are subtracted, the remainder seems rather empty. And on this supposition are the images, etc., incidental, even when we are attending mainly to the relations?

HARVEY ANDREW PETERSON

ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY
NORMAL, ILL.

Education for Efficiency. By E. DAVENPORT. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1909. Pp. 200. $1.00.

The title of the book gives little idea of its contents. The book is a plea for the combination of industrial education with that of the present high-school system, and a discussion of the development of agriculture including an outline for a four-years' course in the high school. The argument may be summarized as follows: "American education aims to be universal education," which means that it must serve all the people in their needs for everyday life; that it must educate for service and efficiency through vocational studies. In working out the problem of industrial education, "which arises as one of the demands of the masses of men for better life and opportunity," it is of utmost importance to prevent class distinction along vocational lines. As the necessities of life are obtained only through the interdependence of these activities, so industrial education cannot be considered by itself alone. The great opportunity of the secondary schools in America today is the combining and interweaving of the industrial and cultural in education as exemplified in state universities. If industrial education is not merged with the present high-school system independent schools will be established, where the aims and tendencies will be largely industrial and commercial and where the greater number will receive their education. Thus will our people be divided into two classes, inevitably drifting farther and farther apart, and we shall no longer be a homogeneous people.

Fortunately many schools have grafted on commercial and industrial courses. These courses should be so planned that those who cannot complete the work may find congenial surroundings and profitable employment when they leave school. More depends upon what we do now than can depend upon what we think or try to do twenty-five years hence.

The aims and purposes of agricultural education are primarily the promotion of public safety in the matter of racial food supply, which before the end of the century will be the largest single issue brought about by increased population.

Professor Davenport will doubtless find many who will object to his assumption that at present there are no distinct class divisions, and he apparently overlooks the isolated social conditions of a large percentage of the people engaged in agriculture.

The absence of an index is to be regretted, especially since the book contains much significant discussion of what is at present perhaps the most important problem in secondary education.

H. C. GIVENS

UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Alcohol: How it Affects the Individual, the Community, and the Race. By HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS. New York: The Century Co., 1909. Pp. viii+151. $0.50 net; postage 5 cents.

This small volume contains two articles "Alcohol and the Individual" and "Alcohol and the Community," which appeared in *McClure's Magazine* in 1908; also a chapter on "Alcohol and the Race," and an appendix.

Dr. Williams has rendered a real service to all who are interested in education and the welfare of the people by bringing together the best scientific material bearing on the evil effects of alcohol. The appearance of this important work is timely, for there is at present a widespread demand for a radical change in the methods of presenting this subject in school books. The substitution of the authoritative scientific facts presented by Dr. Williams for the dogmatic and unscientific material found in the old-school physiologies will be of inestimable value in advancing the cause of temperance.

Human Physiology: An Elementary Textbook of Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene. By JOHN W. RITCHIE. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.: World Book Co., 1909. Pp. 362. $0.80.

This book is very well adapted to the present demand for *balanced* textbooks on physiology and hygiene suitable for the upper grades of the elementary schools. The arrangement of topics, the paragraph headings, the use of italics for important statements of facts, and excellent illustrations deserve commendation. The chapters on "Disease Germs," "Diseases Caused by Protozoa," "Diseases Caused by Bacteria," "Preventing the Spread of Disease Germs," and "Tuberculosis" are particularly good.

The treatment is in general, good; but some unfortunate statements are made, as for instance: "A dislocated or sprained joint should not be rested all the time, but should be exercised, even if the movement causes great pain." Very serious injury often results from exercising a sprained ankle or knee immediately after the injury. It is true that judicious massage and passive movements are used in some cases of sprain with good results, but to advise in a school text "to exercise a dislocated or sprained joint, even if the movement causes great pain" is very dangerous.

The treatment described for accidents, resulting from submergence, is good,

except that the slow Sylvester method of artificial respiration is advocated instead of the quicker and more efficient prone-pressure method.

There is enough scientific material available on the evil effects of alcohol and tobacco to satisfy the state law requirements without making use of unscientific material. Much of the material used in this book in the treatment of these topics is excellent, but some very questionable statements are made under the headings: "Alcohol and Heredity," and "Tobacco and the Skeleton."

The Hygiene of the Schoolroom. By WILLIAM F. BARRY. New York: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1909. Pp. xii+195. $1.50.

This volume is the third enlarged edition of a book, the first edition of which appeared in 1903. The author addresses himself to "educators and others interested in child life." The following topics are discussed in eighteen chapters: "The Selection of a Site for a School Building," "The Construction of School Buildings," "Ventilation," "Heating," "School Furniture," "Light," "The Hygiene of the Eye," "The Hygiene of the Ear," "The Vocal Organs," "Relation of Contagious Diseases to the School," "Medical Inspection of Schools," "Modern Education and Health," "School Diet," "Physical Training and Exercise," "Corporal Punishment," "Sickness and Accident in the Schoolroom," "The Teacher's Health," "Defective Children."

There is a rapidly growing interest among educators and parents in all matters pertaining to the health of school children. Much of the popular literature in magazines and newspapers is unreliable and misleading. There is a real need for books written in plain, untechnical language, giving the essential facts pertaining to the health of school children. The first edition of this volume was written six years ago, before the beginning of the great movement for school hygiene which is now engaging the attention of the whole school world. The third edition has not been brought up to date. Some topics as school furniture, the hygiene of the eye, and the relation of contagious diseases to the school are well treated; the essential facts are stated briefly and concisely. Other topics, such as physical training and medical inspection, are not treated adequately. Such important topics as school playgrounds, outdoor schools, retardation and physical defects, and hygiene of the teeth are omitted entirely.

A book intended for educators ought to have a selected bibliography of the most important references on the various subjects treated.

GEORGE L. MEYLAN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Source Book for Social Origins. By WILLIAM I. THOMAS. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. 932. $4.77 library edition; $3.02 school edition.

"In good sooth, my masters, this is no door. Yet it is a little window, that looketh upon a great world." In this quotation found on the title-page may be found the spirit which animates the *Source Book for Social Origins.*

The book is divided into seven parts treating respectively of: I. The Relations of Society to Geographic and Economic Environment; II. Mental

Life and Education; III. Invention and Technology; IV. Sex and Marriage; V. Art, Ornament, and Decoration; VI. Magic, Religion, and Myth; and VII. Social Organization, Morals, and the State. In each part the author includes valuable extracts from the works of representative investigators in special fields, adding comments at the close of each part, together with an extensive bibliography.

It is impossible to do justice to a work of this kind in the space that can be given to a review of the book; for the volume presents the equivalent of a small carefully selected library accompanied by such comments as an instructor might make to his students. In the interpretation of the selections presented, the author renders assistance to the student by indicating the partial attitudes of those who would interpret all social phenomena in terms of "so-called elemental or dominant forces." "The social process is a complex, and cannot be interpreted by any single phrase." The value of the concept "control" in relating all human activities is discussed and illustrated, and its relation is shown to *attention* as the means of securing control. The discussion of the relation of attention to *habit*, on the one hand, and to *crisis*, on the other, should interest all students of education as well as those of history, economics, and sociology.

In the introductory chapter the author indicates the influence of the theory of evolution upon the development of all the sciences dealing with man and shows how this view precludes the possibility of completely understanding any "single situation in life" from "its immediate aspects alone." "Everything is to be regarded as having an origin and a development, and we cannot afford to overlook the genesis and the stages of change." That this ideal is "incompletely realized" the author freely admits and as a means of encouragement he directs attention to the methods of the biologist and the psychologist. He points out that the biologist does not attempt to explain a given form of life by a study of that alone, but that even closer attention is given to simpler related forms. So the psychologist interprets the adult mind only after he has studied child-psychology as well as that of many forms of animal life. The use of a similar method—a genetic and comparative method—is urged in the study of social life; for it is in the simple forms that the meaning is "writ large," and this is one of the factors in the interpretation of the complex activities of social life. It is thus not as an end in itself that the author urges the study of social origins, but as a means—a means of making a fuller use of a method which yields rich results, a means of bringing missing factors to the solution of complex social problems, a means of bridging the chasm which exists between the biological and social sciences.

Who are the people most likely to profit by the study of this volume? The author indicates the character of the audience he has in mind in these words: "I do not, of course, wish to belittle the effort of the historian to establish his facts, but to the young person who is planning to go into history, economics, civics, education, or psychology, I do wish to make this suggestion: If he will plan his work with reference to gaining (1) a sound and comprehensive knowledge of biology, (2) an even more particular knowledge of psychology, and (3) a very intimate knowledge of anthropology and ethnology, he will find himself in possession of an apparatus which will enable him to do a

rare class of work in his special field. It is for such a person that this volume is prepared, quite as much as for the student of sociology." It certainly is to be hoped that young people preparing to teach in the high schools as well as those teachers who hitherto have not had the opportunity to get the point of view here presented, will be among those who find in this volume a method of interpreting social life.

KATHARINE E. DOPP

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Laboratory Manual of First-Year Science for Secondary Schools. By WATERMAN S. C. RUSSELL AND HOWARD CLINTON KELLY. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1909. Pp. v+163. $0.75.

This manual includes thirty-five exercises, each of which is clearly outlined and accompanied by a set of pertinent questions. With the exception of the exercises in botany, they all have a so-called practical aspect. Aside from this characteristic there is no evidence that any centralizing idea governed the selection of topics. Not only are the exercises in any one science absolutely unrelated to those in any of the others, but those in one group may have no real connection with each other.

The statement made in the preface that the pupil who has completed such a course and who takes no further work in science will have obtained from it a fund of valuable information is surely true. But it scarcely seems that the statement to the effect that the course furnishes a broad foundation to aid the student in the future election of science is justified. For instance, the application of some described tests for adulterants to foods known to be pure or impure, similar tests of pure and impure water, determining whether headache powders are dangerous or not (without explanation of the sign whereby danger is recognized), the application of the litmus test to several substances (after having been *told* the litmus test), one good exercise on flames, and one on charcoal as a filter, will scarcely give the student an adequate notion of what chemistry is. Still less will a few experiments in metric measurements, two in ventilation, two in heating systems, two in magnetism, and two in electric bells and wiring for bells give him a true conception of what physics involves. Moreover, in such an outline, the exercises in botany ought also to have been of a practical nature: for instance, exercises in grafting and pruning and in propagation by slips. The choice made is likely to confirm in the mind of the student the usual though false notion that botany is a science without practical value.

For a person desiring a manual of exercises which will give some training in the mechanical methods of laboratory work and which will teach some heterogeneous facts in applied science, this manual may prove satisfactory. But for one who is in search of a manual the exercises of which will afford training in the scientific method of inquiry and which will compose a unified course involving the elements of the several high-school sciences it will prove useless.

ELMA CHANDLER

FRANK LOUIS SOLDAN HIGH SCHOOL
ST. LOUIS, MO.

BOOKS RECEIVED

EDUCATION

The Educational Meaning of Manual Arts and Industries. By ROBERT KEABLE ROW. Chicago: Row, Peterson & Co., 1909. Pp. 248.

The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets. By JANE ADDAMS. New York: Macmillan, 1909. Pp. 162. $1.25.

Attention and Interest. A Study in Psychology and Education. By FELIX ARNOLD. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. viii+272. $1.00 net.

Das höhere Lehramt in Deutschland und Oesterreich. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Schulgeschichte und zur Schulreform. Von HANS MORSCH. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, mit einem alphabetischen Sach- und Namensregister. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. viii+486. Geh. M. 12; geb. M. 13.

Ueber die literarische Erziehung als ein Problem der Arbeitsschule. Ein Beitrag zur Reform des Sprachunterrichts und der Lesebücher und zu einem Leseplan für die deutsche Jugend. Von SEVERIN RUETTGERS. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. x+156. Geh. M. 1.80; geb. M. 2.20.

Der Begriff der staatsbürgerlichen Erziehung. Von GEORG KERSCHENSTEINER. Leipzig; Teubner, 1910. Pp. vii+62. Geh. M. 1; geb. M. 1.40.

Grundfragen der Schulorganisation. Eine Sammlung von Reden, Aufsätzen, und Organisationsbeispielen. Von GEORG KERSCHENSTEINER. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. vii+296. Geh. M. 3.60; geb. M. 4.20.

Die Oberrealschule und die Schulreformfragen der Gegenwart. Vortrag in der Festsitzung vom 10. Oktober 1909 der 11. Hauptversammlung des Vereins zur Förderung des lateinlosen höheren Schulwesens zu Kassel, gehalten von ALEX. WERNICKE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. 40. M. 0.50.

Das deutsche Unterrichtswesen der Gegenwart. Von KARL KNABE. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 299. Bändchen.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. ii+108. M. 1.25.

The System in German Schools. By E. GEORGE PAYNE. (Bulletin of Kentucky Department of Education, No. 8. New Series 1.) Frankfort: Kentucky Department of Education, 1909. Pp. 75.

The Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I. Health and Education. By THOMAS DENISON WOOD. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910. Pp. 112. $0.80 postpaid.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Fourth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer. New York: 1909. Pp. vi+201.

LATIN

The Teaching of Latin in Secondary Schools. By EUGENE A. HECKER. Boston: The Schoenhof Book Co., 1909. Pp. 129. $0.80.

The Syntax of High-School Latin. Statistics and Selected Examples Arranged under Grammatical Headings and in Order of Occurrence, by Fifty Col-

laborators. Edited by LEE BYRNE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. xi+54. $0.83 postpaid.

The Phormio of Terence. Simplified for the Use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By H. R. FAIRCLOUGH AND LEON J. RICHARDSON. (The Students' Series of Latin Classics.) Boston: Benjamin H. Sanborn & Co., 1909. Pp. xiv+117. Illustrated.

ENGLISH

A Study of the Drama. By BRANDER MATHEWS. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910. Pp. x+320. Illustrated. $1.25.

Walden, or Life in the Woods. By HENRY DAVID THOREAU. Edited with Introduction and Notes by BYRON REES. (Macmillan's Pocket Classics.) New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xxx+388. $0.25.

Study Book in English Literature from Chaucer to the Close of the Romantic Period. By E. R. HOOKER. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1910. Pp. x+315. With a map. $1.00.

The Life of William Shakespeare, Expurgated. By WILLIAM LEAVITT STODDARD. Boston: W. A. Butterfield, 1910. Pp. v+80. With a frontispiece. $1.25.

The "Aeneid" of Virgil. Translated into English Verse. By THEODORE C. WILLIAMS. (The Riverside Literature Series.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910. Pp. xxiii+503. Illustrated. $0.75.

The "Aeneid" of Virgil. Translated into English Prose. By JOHN CONINGTON. Edited with Introduction and Notes by EDGAR S. SHUMWAY. (Macmillan's Pocket Classics.) New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xxviii+348. With a map. $0.25.

A College Course in Writing from Models. Arranged, with Introduction and Notes, by FRANCES CAMPBELL BERKELEY. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910. Pp. xiii+478. $1.25.

Theme-Book in English Composition. By ALFRED M. HITCHCOCK. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910. vii+113. $0.50.

FRENCH

La France. Passé, Présent, Avenir. Par P. M. CRÉTIN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. viii+184. With diagrams, charts, and maps. M. 2.40.

La petite princesse. Par JEANNE MAIRET. Edited for school use by EDITH HEALY. New York: American Book Co., 1910. Pp. 154. $0.35.

Madame Thérèse. Par ERCKMANN-CHATRIAN. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by EDWARD MANLEY. (Heath's Modern Language Series.) Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1910. Pp. xiv+167. $0.40.

Pierrille. Par JULES CLARETIE. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by HUGH A. SMITH AND CASIMER ZDANOWICZ. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910. Pp. vii+201. $0.40.

GERMAN

Easy German Stories. By C. E. RIES. Edited with Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary, by ERNEST H. BIERMANN. New York: American Book Co., 1910. Pp. 183. $0.35.

Herein: First German Readings. Edited by PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910. Pp. viii+289. Illustrated by Julie C. Pratt. $0.40.

Exercises in German Syntax and Composition for Advanced Students. By MARIAN P. WHITNEY AND LILIAN L. STROEBE. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1910. Pp. ix+194. $0.80.

German Prose Composition. With Notes and Vocabularies. By CARL W. F. OSTHAUS AND ERNEST H. BIERMANN. New York: American Book Co., 1909. Pp. 191. $0.65.

German Verb Blank. Arranged by ROBERT J. KELLOGG. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1909. Pp. 46.

HISTORY AND CIVICS

The Leading Facts of American History. By D. H. MONTGOMERY. Revised ed. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1910. Pp. xiv+400+xcviii. Illustrated. $1.00.

Panama and the Canal. By ALFRED B. HALL AND CLARENCE L. CHESTER. New York: Newson & Co., 1910. Pp. ix+236. Illustrated. $0.75.

American Government. For Use in Secondary Schools. By ROSCOE LEWIS ASHLEY. Revised and Rewritten. New York: Macmillan, 1910. Pp. xxix+356+xxxi. $1.00 net.

MATHEMATICS

Rara Arithmetica. A catalogue of the arithmetics written before the year MDCI with a description of those in the library of George Arthur Plimpton of New York. By DAVID EUGENE SMITH. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1908. Pp. xvi+507. With many facsimiles. $5.50.

MISCELLANEOUS

Tenth Annual Meeting of the National Civic Federation, New York, November 22 and 23, 1909. New York: National Civic Federation, 1910. Pp. xviii+347. Illustrated.

Library of Congress Publications Issued Since 1897. January, 1909. Pp. 46.

Year Book of the Public Schools Athletic League of the City of New York, 1909. Pp. 125. Illustrated.

The Moral Equivalent of War. By WILLIAM JAMES. (International Conciliation, February, 1910, No. 27.) New York: American Association for International Conciliation, 1910. Pp. 20.

The Literature of the Peace Movement. By EDWIN D. MEAD. Boston: International School of Peace, 1909. Pp. 14.

The Mission of the United States in the Cause of Peace. By DAVID J. BREWER. Boston: International School of Peace, 1910. Pp. 23.

Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents, Washington, D. C., January 19 and 20, 1910. Pp. 127.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE IN THE PERIODICALS[1]

IRENE WARREN
Librarian, School of Education, The University of Chicago

ALEXANDER, JOHN W. The need of a National Academy and its value to the growth of art in America. Craftsman. 17:607–18. (Mr. '10.)

BARTON, WILLIAM E. The library as a minister in the field of religious art. Relig. Educa. 4:594–603. (Fe. '10.)

BURSTALL, SARA A. Independent study in schools. School W. 12:44–46. (Fe. '10.)

BUTLER, NATHANIEL. The teacher as a constructive force. Relig. Educa. 4:550–60. (Fe. '10.)

(The) confessions of a teacher (I). Journ. of Educa. (Bost.) 71:201–3. (24 Fe. '10.)

COPE, HENRY F. Textbooks on morals and ethics. Relig. Educa. 4:575–81. (Fe. '10.)

DIXSON, ZELLA A. The share of the library in religious education. Relig. Educa. 4:588–93. (Fe. '10.)

(The) educational value of the camera. Craftsman. 17:647–56. (Mr. '10.)

FAUNCE, WILLIAM H. P. Church and religious education. Relig. Educa. 4:527–30. (Fe. '10.)

HEFFRON, JOHN L. The moral value of the teaching of the physiology and hygiene of sex in the public schools. Relig. Educa. 4:543–49. (Fe. '10.)

HODGE, RICHARD M. Time-relations of church and school. Relig. Educa. 4:568–72. (Fe. '10.)

HRBEK, SARKA. The library and the foreign-born citizen. Pub. Lib. 15: 98–104. (Mr. '10.)

HUGHES, JAMES L. Definite tests for the moral efficiency of state schools. Relig. Educa. 4:561–68. (Fe. '10.)

KNOX, RAYMOND C. Moral and religious training in college associations. Relig. Educa. 4:582–85. (Fe. '10.)

MACLEISH, MARTHA H. The home in religious education. Relig. Educa. 4:572–75. (Fe. '10.)

[1] Abbreviations.—Amer. Educa., American Education; Craftsman, The Craftsman Magazine; Educa. R., Educational Review; Harp. W., Harper's Weekly; Journ. of Educa. (Bost.), Journal of Education (Boston); Psycholog. Clinic, Psychological Clinic; Pub. Lib., Public Libraries; Relig. Educa., Religious Education; School W., School World; South. Educa. R., Southern Educational Review; Teach. Coll. Rec., Teacher's College Record.

MELL, P. H. The college attitude toward the high school. South. Educa. R. 6:17–20. (Ap., My., Je., and Jl. '09.)

MURRAH, W. B. Right views of education. South. Educa. R. 6:1–9. (Ap., My., Je., and Jl. '09.)

O'GRADY, HARDRESS. The teaching of French in the training colleges. School W. 12:49–50. (Fe. '10.)

PRITCHETT, HENRY S. Advertising the colleges. Harp. W. 104:9, 34. (19 Fe. '10.)

RAYLEIGH, PETER. Education in China. Educa. R. 18:30–39. (Fe. '10.)

ROSE, WICKLIFFE. Education as a public business. South. Educa. R. 6: 10–16. (Ap. '09.)

SADLER, M. E. The relation of elementary schools to technical schools, day and evening. School W. 12:41–44. (Fe. '10.)

SCHLEGEL, GEORGE S. The Reading free dental dispensary. Psycholog. Clinic. 3:249–54. (15 Fe. '10.)

SEIPMANN, OTTO. Education in England and abroad. School W. 12:50–53. (Fe. '10.)

SNEDDEN, DAVID. The movement for vocational education and its probable effects on liberal education (I). Amer. Educa. 13:252–55. (Fe. '10.)

WILSON, LOUIS N. The library and the teaching profession. Pub. Lib. 15:93–98. (Mr. '10.)

WINSHIP, A. E. Vocational training in the public schools; what are the real causes of the present movement? Journ. of Educa. (Bost.) 71: 143. (10 Fe. '10.)

WITMER, LIGHTNER. The restoration of children of the slums. Psycholog. Clinic. 3:266–80. (15 Fe. '10.)

WOODHULL, JOHN F. The teaching of physical science. Teach. Coll. Rec. 11:1–82. (Ja. '10.)